

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now Sri M. C. Narasimhan is to call the attention of grant to a subject of importance. He is not here.

Sri G. B. SHANKAR RAO.—I have given notice.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—It will come in due course.

## THE MYSORE LAND REFORMS BILL, 1961, AS REPORTED BY JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

*Motion to consider—Debate (contd).*

† Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—Hon'ble Members are aware that the Mysore Land Reforms Bill had been referred to a Joint Select Committee consisting of 46 persons. The Joint Select Committee held 64 sittings, heard 17 witnesses, considered a number of representations, comments and memoranda submitted to it. It also considered the recommendations of the Planning Commission. In the light of these and in the light of the discussions that had taken place in the legislature, the Joint Select Committee examined the provisions of the Bill and submitted its report on 25th March 1961.

The original Bill had provided for the following among other things:—

- (i) fixation of ceiling for personal cultivation,
- (ii) leases,
- (iii) resumption for personal cultivation by the landlords, and
- (iv) conferment of occupancy rights on tenants in respect of non-resumable lands.

Provision had been made in the Bill for the constitution of a Land Commission to determine the area of the family holding for each local area; the area so determined was to have an average yield fetching a net income of Rs. 1,200 per annum. The ceiling area was not to exceed 3 family holdings. In the case of large families, 6 family holdings were permitted. In the case of Aliasanthana families, 9 family holdings were permitted. Provision had been made for exempting certain classes of lands including plantations from the operation of the ceiling. The Joint Select Committee after a careful consideration of all the relevant factors have come to the conclusion that the ceiling area, the family holding and the basic holding should be determined in terms of standard acres instead of being fixed on the basis of the net income. In view of this decision, they have come to the conclusion that there is no need for a Land Commission. Accordingly provision has been made in the amended Bill itself for classifying the different categories of land and for determining the extent of land that should constitute a standard acre in respect of each class of land. The Committee has prescribed a formula for this purpose

in Schedule 1 of the amended Bill. According to the decision of the Select Committee, 2 standard acres will constitute a basic holding; 6 standard acres will constitute a family holding; 27 standard acres will constitute a ceiling area. Where a family or a joint family consists of more than 5 Members, each member in excess of 5 will be permitted to hold 6 additional standard acres subject to the condition that the aggregate area to be held by the family will not exceed twice the ceiling area, however large the family may be.

The original Bill had made provision for exempting areca and cocoanut from the ceiling. The Joint Select Committee has decided that there is no need to exempt these two crops as they do not strictly come under the definition of the plantation crops mentioned in the Report of the Planning Commission. The definition of the words 'protected tenant' has been amplified so as to cover the cases of tenants who were recognised as protected tenants in the Bombay Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1948 and in the Hyderabad Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1950 and with a view to give relief to certain other classes of tenants who are holding lands for a long period.

In the original Bill, Land Commission should have determined the standard yield and rent payable by the tenants. In the Amended Bill, the prescribed authority will determine the average yield for each local area and for each class of land. The average yield so determined shall be in force for a period of 5 years. This average yield will be the gross produce for the purpose of determining the rent payable by the tenant.

With regard to future leases, the original Bill had permitted small holders, minors, widows, unmarried women, disabled persons and members of the armed forces to create or continue the tenancy or lease the lands owned by them. The Joint Select Committee has decided that widows and unmarried women need not have the privilege of leasing out their lands in future. A new clause has been inserted in the amended Bill with a view to make it obligatory for the landlord to give first option to the tenant to purchase the land he is cultivating whenever the landlord intends selling the land. The clauses relating to the resumption of lands from the tenants and the conditions under which such resumption can take place have been simplified. In the original Bill, a person was deemed to supervise the cultivation of the land personally provided that he resided at a place not more than 10 miles from the land. The Joint Select Committee has deleted this restriction.

According to the original Bill, compensation payable to the landlords in respect of non-resumable lands, i.e., lands which are to be registered in the name of the tenants was the aggregate of 15 times the excess of rent over the land revenue. The Select Committee has decided that the compensation payable in such cases should be the aggregate of 15 times the value in cash of one-fourth of the gross produce in the case of lands possessing facilities for assured irrigation, or 15 times



(Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA)

the value in cash of one-fifth of the gross produce in the case of other lands and 50 per cent of the value of trees belonging to the landlord and the depreciated value of any structures constructed by the landlord. There is one mistake here. From 15 times the value you have to deduct the land revenue.

With regard to the mode of payment of compensation to the landlords in respect of lands to be registered in the name of the tenants, the original Bill had provided for the payment of compensation in cash if the land was less than a basic holding and in other cases in instalments not exceeding 20 with interest at  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent per annum or in negotiable bonds with a similar rate of interest. The Joint Select Committee has decided that the compensation should be paid in cash and in one lumpsum, if it does not exceed Rs. 10,000 and the balance if any, should be paid in negotiable bonds carrying interest at  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent per annum maturing within a specified period not exceeding 20 years. In the original Bill, compensation payable in respect of lands taken over by the State Government from persons who are having more than the ceiling area was 15 times the average net annual income of the land. The Joint Select Committee decided that the compensation payable in such cases should be 10 times the annual net income.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What about land revenue in this case.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—A separate principle has been adopted here.

In the Chapter relating to the management of lands, several clauses have been deleted. The Committee were of the view that it was not necessary to have elaborate provisions relating to the assumption of management of lands by the Government. They were of the view that it was sufficient if provision was made for the cultivation of lands when they were left uncultivated in spite of notice given to the owner. If a land is not cultivated in spite of the notice, the Assistant Commissioner may lease out the uncultivated land for a period not exceeding 5 years. After the expiry of the lease period, the Assistant Commissioner will deliver possession of the land to the person entitled to such possession. For the service rendered by the Government, the owner of the land should pay to Government an amount equal to four times the land revenue payable for the land. Modifications have been made in the Chapter relating to co-operative farming. The element of compulsion has been eliminated. In the original Bill two-thirds of the total number of small holders holding not less than two-thirds of the aggregate area in the small holdings could compel the remaining small holders to join a co-operative farm. This clause has been eliminated. According to the amended Bill, the starting of a co-operative farm is a purely voluntary venture.

It has been stated specifically in the amended Bill that when once a ceiling is fixed, subsequent changes in the classification of the land due to improvements effected at the cost of the land owner or subsequent decrease in the number of the members of the family should not be a ground for reducing the ceiling.

The Committee has decided that instead of the Assistant Commissioner, a judicial officer of the rank of a Munsiff should function as the tribunal and the clause relating to the procedure to be followed by the tribunal and the Deputy Commissioner has been modified to some extent. In the case of the tribunal the procedure to be followed is the procedure prescribed for the court of small causes. In the case of the Deputy Commissioner, he should exercise the powers under the Land Revenue Code. Specific provision has been made in the amended Bill for the appellate authority to stay the execution of the orders of a subordinate authority. Provision has been made in the amended Bill for the rules and notifications under the Act being laid before the Legislature. Provision has also been made to provide legal assistance to the poor tenants at the cost of the State in any proceedings under this Bill. The original Bill had barred the appearance of lawyers before the tribunals excepting under special circumstances. The Select Committee has removed this bar.

I have so far dealt with only the major changes made by the Joint Select Committee and I consider that there is no need for me to weary you by dealing with all the minor changes also. Several comments and representations have been received in regard to this measure. Before I deal with them I should like to explain briefly the scheme and main features of the Bill as amended by the Joint Select Committee.

### *Ceiling*

*Main Features of the Bill as amended by the Select Committee.*—For the purpose of fixing, family holding and basic holding and have been divided into 7 categories. The ceiling area, the family holding and the basic holding have to be determined in terms of standard acres which again will be determined on the basis of the formula and with reference to the classification of lands as provided in Schedule I. Two standard acres will constitute a basic holding, 6 standard acres a family holding. 27 standard acres a ceiling area. In the case of first class land, i.e., wet or garden land which has irrigation facilities sufficient to grow two wet crops, the extent of the ceiling area will come to 27 ordinary acres. In the case of fourth class land for example, rain-fed wet or garden land in Malnad, the ceiling area will be 54 ordinary acres. In the case of fifth class of land, i.e., dry or garden land in areas where the rain fall is more than 35 inches, the ceiling area will come to 108 acres. In the case of land belonging to the last category, viz., seventh class, i.e., dry or garden land in areas where the rain fall is less than 25 inches, the extent of ceiling area will come to 216 acres. If the family consists of about 10 persons, each family will be entitled to have double the area

## (Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA)

referred to above. Plantation crops (i.e., Coffee, Tea, Rubber Cardamom and Pepper) orchards, specialised farms, lands used by sugarcane farms and efficiently managed farms are exempted from the operation of the ceiling. In the case of plantation crops, the following ceiling limits or prescribed with regard to future acquisitions:—

Coffee, Rubber and Tea	...	100 acres
Cardamom	... ..	50 „
Pepper	... ..	25 „

The lands in excess of the ceiling should be surrendered to the State Government.

*Compensation for Surplus Land*

For the Lands Surrendered to Government, the land owner will get compensation calculated at ten times the average net annual income of the land. Compensation up to Rs. 10,000 will be paid in lumpsum in cash and the remainder will be paid in the form of negotiable bonds carrying interest at  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent per annum maturing at a specified time not exceeding 20 years.

*Leases*

In future, only small holders (having not more than 3 basic holding) minors, people who are incapable of cultivating the land by reason of physical or mental disability and serving members of the armed forces may lease out their lands. The rent payable shall not exceed  $\frac{1}{10}$ th of the gross produce in the case of lands possessing facilities for assured irrigation and  $\frac{1}{5}$  of the gross produce in the case of other lands. The prescribed authority will notify the average yield for each of the principal crops for each class and grade of and in each local area and that average yield will be deemed to be gross produce for the purpose of determining the rent payable by the tenants.

*Resumption for Personal Cultivation*

After the Bill becomes Law, the landlords who have leased out their lands may file a Statement before the tribunal indicating their intention to resume their land for personal cultivation subject to the following conditions :—

- (1) No land can be resumed from the permanent tenants.
- (2) If the tenant owns lands or is entitled to non-resumable land, the aggregate of which is equal to or more than the land owned by the landlord and the landlord owns land not exceeding the basic holding, the landlord can resume the entire land leased by him. In other cases the landlord can resume half the area leased to the tenant.
- (3) The landlord who is already in possession of three family holdings cannot resume any land leased to the tenants.

(4) A landlord can resume only up to three family holdings.

(5) If the tenant is a protected tenant, he should be left with at least a basic holding or the land actually cultivated by him whichever is less.

The lands other than those which a landlord can resume shall vest in Government. These non-resumable lands will be given to the tenants subject to their paying the premium which is equal to the compensation payable to the landlord. This premium may be paid in twenty instalments.

#### *Compensation for the non-resumable land*

The Compensation payable to the landlords in respect of non-resumable lands which are intended to be registered in the name of the tenants shall be 15 times of the 1/4th of the gross produce in the case of lands possessing facilities for assured irrigation, or 15 times of the 1/5th of the gross produce in the case of their lands *plus* 50 per cent of the value of the trees and the depreciated value of the buildings, if any, belonging to the landlord. As in the case of surplus lands which are surrendered to Government, compensation to the landlords is payable in cash in lumpsum if the same does not exceed Rs. 10,000. But where it exceeds Rs. 10,000, it will be paid in negotiable bonds carrying 4½ per cent interest.

#### *First Option to Tenants*

In future, when the landlords intend selling their lands, they should give first option to the tenants.

#### *Disposal of Surplus Lands*

The surplus lands that vest in Government shall be disposed of in the following order :—

- (1) Co-operative farms the members of which are displaced tenants or landless agriculturists or agricultural labourers.
- (2) Displaced tenants.
- (3) Landless agriculturists and agricultural labourers.
- (4) Tenants and displaced tenants with less than a basic holding and owner-cultivators with less than a basic holding.
- (5) Tenants, displaced tenants, owner-cultivators with less than a family holding.
- (6) Other persons.

#### *Transfer to Non-Agriculturists Barred*

After the Bill becomes Law, transfer of agricultural land to non-agriculturists will be barred except with the permission of the Assistant Commissioner, but transfers to Government, Co-operative Societies and Coffee Board are permitted.

**(SRI KADIDAL MANJAPPA)*****Cultivation of Uncultivated Lands***

Where a land has remained uncultivated for a period of two years without sufficient cause, the Assistant Commissioner may issue a notice requiring the owner or any other person entitled to be in possession to cultivate the land within a period of one year. If the land is not cultivated in spite of the notice, the Assistant Commissioner may after an enquiry lease out the land so uncultivated for a period five years, to any other person. At the end of five years, the Assistant Commissioner may restore possession of the land to the person entitled to be in possession.

***Co-operative Farming***

Special concessions and facilities may be given with a view to give a fillip to the starting of co-operative farms on a voluntary basis. Ten or more persons of a village holding 50 acres or more may form a Co-operative Farm.

***Tribunal and its Functions and Appeals***

Judicial officers of the rank of Munsiff will be appointed to perform the functions of the Tribunal. The tribunal will perform the duties enumerated in Section 112 of the Bill. The appellate authority shall be a District Judge. An appeal will lie to the appellate authority against the decision of the Tribunal. Under the Bill, there are some functions which have to be performed by the Deputy Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioner. Against the decision of the Deputy Commissioner or the Assistant Commissioner, an appeal will lie to the Mysore Revenue Appellate Tribunal. The appellate authority or the Revenue Appellate Tribunal may refer any question of Law for the decision of the High Court.

***Legal Assistance to the Tenants***

Provision has been made in the Bill for giving legal assistance to the tenants who are poor.

After the Report of the Select Committee was presented to the House, a number of representations have been presented to Government, a number of comments have also appeared in the press and on the platform. The Central Land Reform Committee have also made some suggestions. Some people have denounced the Report on the plea that it is too radical. Some have criticised it on the ground that it is favourable to the land owners and the landlords. Some others have attacked the very principle of enacting land reforms. Some have commented that the ceiling is too high. The Central Land Reform Committee of the Planning Commission have suggested that the ceiling should be reduced. But in a measure like this, it is not possible to give satisfaction to all the people concerned. The Select Committee have done their best to evolve a system which would do justice to both the landlords and the tenants.

With regard to the arguments advanced by some people that there should be no land reforms. I humbly wish to point out that it is too reverse the policy. For more than a decade, we have been promising the people that we are enacting land reforms. Moreover in this State, there are five sets of Law governing the subject. In Belgaum and Gulbarga Divisions, there are already laws relating to land reforms. Some of the provisions in these law are stayed on the ground that there is need for enacting a uniform law. A Committee had been set up under the Chairmanship of Sri B. D. Jatti our present Chief Minister to go into the question of enacting a uniform law. On the recommendation of that Committee, a Bill was drafted and introduced in this House. The said Bill was considered by the Joint Select Committee. We are now considering the Joint Select Committee's Report. How can we go back now? We, in this country, have resolved to build a socialistic order of society on the foundations of science and technology by democratic means and constitutional methods. Socialistic pattern of Society aims at securing social justice, equal opportunities for all and elimination of disparities. From this point of view also, land reforms are necessary. From the criticisms levelled by some people who advocate free enterprise, I could gather that there are at least some well-to-do people in this country who have absolutely no sympathy for the poor and the down-trodden. A society, in which the 'haves' have no sympathy for 'have nots' cannot progress. Some people find fault with the Bill on the ground that no provision has been made for exempting religious and charitable institutions. I would like to humbly point out that in this Country religion once flourished on the high pedestals of truth, right conduct, renunciation, fellow-feeling, devotion to God and self-realisation. Religion can never plead that it should thrive at the cost of the down-trodden poor tenants. Indian Philosophy is a Socialist Philosophy. It is based on the belief that God dwells in every human heart. Even in our daily worship, we say "Sarve Jana Sukinoh Bhavanthu" May all people be happy.

With these remarks, I commend the report for the kind consideration of the House.

2-00 P.M.

Sri J. VENKATAPPA.—For how many days will this Report be before the House for consideration?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Business Advisory Committee will decide it.

Sri J. VENKATAPPA.—What is the time limit for speeches?

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will see that.

Sri J. VENKATAPPA.—I would request the Chair to give an opportunity for those members who have not so far taken part in the discussion of the Jatti Committee Report or in this Bill at its consideration stage.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಮೇರೆ ಆಗಲೇ ಯಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಯಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಹಿಂದಿನ ಲೆಕ್ಕವನ್ನು ತರಿಸಿ ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

**ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ವೆಂಕಟಪ್ಪ.**—ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ತಾವು ಮತ್ತು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರಕ್ಕೆ ಪರಿಗಣನೆ  
ಏನು? ಅದೇನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಿ?

**ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.**—ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡೋಣ.

† **ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).**—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ತಾವು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಏನೇನೋ ಅದ್ವಿ  
ಅತಂಕಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದೊಡ್ಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ನಾನೀಗ ತಮ್ಮ ಮೂಲಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರನ್ನು ಒಂದು  
ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿಪಕ್ಷವೂ ಆ ಬಡೆಟ್ ಅಧಿವೇಶನ  
ಎಷ್ಟು ಪರಿಶ್ರಮವಾದುದೋ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಈಗ ಚರ್ಚೆಗಿಡು  
ತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರವೂ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಪರಿಶ್ರಮವಾದದ್ದು. ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಈಗತಾನೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ  
ಕೊಡಿಸುತ್ತ ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ down-trodden ಜನತೆಗೆ ಯಾವುದೆಂಬೋ ಅವಕಾಶ  
ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವಿಚಾರ ಇದು, ಈ Have, Have-nots ಎಂತ ಏನೇನೋ ಬಹಳ ಪರಿಶ್ರ  
ಮದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ವಿಚಾರ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಇಂಥ  
ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ರಾಜಕಾರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಕಡೆಯಲ್ಲಿ “ಸರ್ವೇ  
ಜನಾ ಸುಖಿನೋ ಭವತು” ಎಂತ ಬೇರೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ  
ಕೆಲವು ಸಂಶಯಗಳುಂಟಾಗಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೊಂಚ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಕಾರಾವಕಾಶ  
ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ ಮೇಲಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ನೆಗೆ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವರೆ  
ಉತ್ತಮವಾಗುತ್ತೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಆದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ  
14 ವರ್ಷಗಳಾಯಿತು. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಎಂದೂ ಹೇಳದೆ ಇದ್ದ ಈ “ಸರ್ವೇ ಜನಾ ಸುಖಿನೋ  
ಭವತು” ಎಂಬ ಶ್ಲೋಕವನ್ನು ಹಾಕುತ್ತ ಇದ್ದವರಲ್ಲಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಕಿತ್ತಾಡುವುದು  
ಇಲ್ಲಿಂದವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಈ ಕೆಲಸವಲ್ಲ ಜಿತ್ತಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮುಂದುವರಿದು ಮುಂಗವಾಗಬೇಕಾದ್ದಾರೆ....

**MR. SPEAKER.**—The recommendations on the Land Reforms Bill  
have been before the House since the last session and whatever the  
Hon'ble Minister has said is in amplification of those recommendations.

**ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.**—ತಮ್ಮ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ “ಪೋಲಿ ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು  
ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ—ಅವುಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಅವರಿಗೂ ಹೇಗಿ ಅವರ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಮುಂದೆಯೇ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ  
ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಅವುಗಳೊಂದೂ ಎನ್ನೂ ಜಾತಿಗೇ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ! ಈಗತಾನೆ ವಾಸ್ತವ  
ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಂದ. ಹೊಸ ಬೆಳಕನ್ನು ಚೆಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ  
ದವರು ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯಸ್ಥ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ  
ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂತ ಏನೇನೋ ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಲು  
ಕಾರಾವಕಾಶ ಬೇಕು. ಅದರಿಂದ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ನಾಳೆಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ ಎಂತ ಕೇಳಿ  
ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರು.

ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಒಂದು ಅಗ್ನಿಮೆಂಟ್  
ಆಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅದೇಕೆ ಮರೆತು ಹೋಯಿತೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೋಮೋಪತಿಕ್ ಬರ  
ಪಾನಾದಮೇರೆ ಎರಡು ಗಂಟೆಗಳಕಾಲ ಕುಳಿತು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥ  
ವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ತಮ್ಮ ಮೂಲಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

**Sri B. D. JATTI.**—The request of the Hon'ble Member is very  
simple. The Bill is before the House and the report of the Joint Select  
Committee is also before the House. All the Members, I presume,  
have read this carefully. If they want any clarification, the Hon'ble  
Minister for Revenue will reply, and then the discussion will be easy.

Whether it is half an hour or one hour, let any member who wants any clarification, ask the Hon'ble Minister and he will reply. I think that will satisfy all the members of the House.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಬಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಬಹುಶಃ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹುಟ್ಟಿದಮೇಲೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಕಣ್ಣು ಬಿಟ್ಟದೆಯೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಮನೂವೇಸನ್ನು ಕ್ಲಾಬು ವಾರಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಕ್ಕಬೇಕು. ಅನೇಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ನಿಧಾನವಾದರೂ ಚಿಂತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ, ಹೆಚ್ಚು ವಿವರಗಳು ಕುಳಿತರೂ ಚಿಂತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ, ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವಂತೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಭಾನಾಯಕರೂ ಸಹ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ವ್ಯಾಗ್ಯಮಂ ಚ್ಚಿಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—What is the ceiling limit? What is the suggestion of the Planning Commission in respect of ceiling limit?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—18 ಸ್ಕ್ವೇರಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಳೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ವಿ. ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಪಾರಿಗೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ದೊರೆಯಬಹುದು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ನುಮಾರು 25 ಲಕ್ಷ ನಾನ್‌ರೆಸ್ಕೂಮೆಬರ್ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಗೇಣಿ ದಾರರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನುಮಾರು ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ಎಕರೆ ಸರ್ವೆಸ್ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಜಮೀನಿಲ್ಲದವರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Supposing it is agreed to adopt the suggestion of the Planning Commission to reduce the ceiling limit, what is the area available.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It is a matter for calculation.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಬಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಒಂದು ನಂಸಾರದಲ್ಲ ಪತ್ತು ಜನರಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಲ್ಲವ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಬೇಸಿಸ್‌ಮೇಲೆ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವೆ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It is an interpretation of the Act.

“Any ten or more persons of a village or two or more contiguous villages holding between them, either as land owners or tenants, rights in and possession over fifty acres or more in such village or contiguous villages and desiring to start a Co-operative Farm comprising the land so held and possessed by them.....”

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಬಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಫ್ಯಾಮಿಲಿ ಹೋಲ್ಡರ್ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಫಾರಂ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದರೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಎಂದು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ 27 ಎಕರೆ ಟ್ರೈಕ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಯಲ್ಲವೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಫ್ಯಾಮಿಲಿಗೆ ಯಾವರಿತೆ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮನೂವೇಸುಲ್ಲ ನಮೂದಿಸಲಾಗಿವೆ.



ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ಒಬ್ಬನಿಗೆ 40 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿದ್ದು ಎರಡು—ಮೂರು ಮಕ್ಕಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಇರುವ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ ಖುಷ್ತಿ, ತರಿ, ಬಾಗಾಯ್ತು ಜಮೀನಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಚೀನಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಾ? ಅಥವಾ ನೀವು ಇಷ್ಟಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಾ? ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಅಡಿಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ತೆಂಗಿನತೋಟ, ಗದ್ದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡುವವರು ಯಾರು? ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾರದವನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಾ? ಇವಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಏನಿದೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಇದೆ. ಟ್ರಬಲ್ಮೆನರ್ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಷ್ಟವಾಗದಹಾಗೆ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಇರುವ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಬ್ಬನಿಗೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಮಕ್ಕಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಆವರಿಗಾಗುವಷ್ಟು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಉಳಿದುದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಮುಂದೆ ಆ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ದೊಡ್ಡವರಾಗಿ ಮದುವೆಯಾದಮೇಲೆ ಪಡೆಯುವ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಏನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತದೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಒಂದು ಸಂಸಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಐದು ಜನರಿದ್ದ 27 ಸ್ಕ್ವೇರ್ಡರ್ ಎಕರೆಗೆ 7 ಸಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು, ಹತ್ತು ಜನರಿದ್ದರೆ ಇನ್ನೂ 27 ಎಕರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು.

This country is a poor country. We have to equitably distribute whatever we have.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಬಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—72 ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ರೈತರು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಇರುವ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವೇನು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ರೈತರಿಂದ 20 ಕಂತುಗಳಿಗೆ ವಿಾರದಂತೆ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಬಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ನಟ್ ಇನ್‌ಕಂ  $\frac{1}{4}$  ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸಿಲಿಂಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಇರುವ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ರೈತರಿಂದ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ರೈತರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ ಗ್ರಾನ್ ಇನ್‌ಕಂ ಮೇಲೆ ರೆಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾಕಿ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು. ಇದರಿಂದ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—72ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ನಮೂದಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರಾಸರಿ ನಟ್ ಇನ್‌ಕಂ ಹತ್ತರಷ್ಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. 72 ಮತ್ತು 78ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜುಗಳೆರಡನ್ನೂ ಓದಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಸ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮೇಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ಕ್ವೇರ್ಡರ್ ಎಕರೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ 7 ವಿಧಗಳಿವೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ವರ್ಗದ ಜಮೀನಿನಿಂದ ರವಳಕ್ಕೆ ಎರಡು ತರೀ ಬೆಳೆಗಳನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಯುವುದು, ಎರಡು ಭತ್ತದ ಬೆಳೆ ಬೆಳೆಯುವ ನೀರಾವರಿ ಸೌಕರ್ಯವಿರುವ ತರೀ ಅಥವಾ ಬಾಗಾಯ್ತು ಜಮೀನು. ಎರಡನೆಯ ವರ್ಗದ ಜಮೀನು wet land or garden land other than First Class land possessing facilities for assured irrigation. That is, land in channel area (Nala Pradesh) where are crop of paddy can be raised in a year. ಮಂಡ್ಯ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಲೆ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಇರುವ ಜಮೀನು ಈ ವರ್ಗಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೇ ತರಿ ಬೆಳೆ ತೆಗೆಯುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ವರ್ಗದ ಜಮೀನು ಫ್ಯಾಮಿಲಿ ಹೋಲ್ಡಿಂಗ್‌ಗೆ ಆರು ಎಕರೆ ಇರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಎರಡನೆಯ ವರ್ಗದ ಜಮೀನು ಎಂಟು ಎಕರೆ ಇರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ವರ್ಗದ standard acre, ಎಂದರೆ ಮಂಡ್ಯ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಬೆಳೆ ಬೆಳೆಯುವ ತು ಪ್ರದೇಶ; ಒಂದು ಬೆಳೆ ಬೆಳೆಯುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶವಲ್ಲ. ಮೊದಲ ವರ್ಗದ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ 27 ordinary acres, ಎರಡನೇಯ ವರ್ಗದ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ 35 ಎಕರೆ, 3 ನೆಯದಕ್ಕೆ 45 ಎಕರೆ, 4 ನೆಯ ವರ್ಗಕ್ಕೆ 54 ಎಕರೆ, 5ನೆಯ ವರ್ಗದ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ 108 ಎಕರೆ, 6 ನೆಯದಕ್ಕೆ 162 ಎಕರೆ, 7 ನೆಯದಕ್ಕೆ 216 ಎಕರೆ.

2-30 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ವೆಂಕಟರದ್ಡಿ.—25 ಅಂಗುಲಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಳೆ ಬೀಳುವ ಹಾಗಾದಲ್ಲಿ 216 ಎಕರೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಷ್ಟೇ ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳಿದ್ದರೂ ಮಳೆ ಮಾತ್ರ 25 ಅಂಗುಲಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಕಡಮೆಯಾದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರ್ಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೊಡಬಹುದೇ? ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಕೋರಾರ್ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವುಕಡೆ 25 ಅಂಗುಲಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಳೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಬೇರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳಿವೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ 216 ಎಕರೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕದಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಎಳನೆಯ ವರ್ಗದ ಜಮೀನಾದರೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಫ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಒಂದು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ 150 ಅಂಗುಲ ಮಳೆ ಬಿದ್ದು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ 20 ಅಂಗುಲ ಬಿದ್ದರೆ, district average ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರೋ ಅಥವಾ taluk average ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹಾಕುತ್ತೀರೋ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕವಿಮಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—Taluk average, district average ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ average ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲೇಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಚಿಕ್ಕರಾಯ ಪಟ್ಟಣವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶವು ಆಗುವ ಮಳೆ ಹಲಾ ಪುನಃ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ zone ಗಳಾಗಿ ವಿಂಗಡಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಫ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಎಂದು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕದಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಇಲ್ಲ, ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಎಂದು ನಾವು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಮಳೆನಾಡಾಗಬಹುದು. ಮೈದಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ, ಮಲೆನಾಡಿಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎಚ್. ಪುಷ್ಪಣ್ಣ.—ಇನಾಮು ರಸ್ತೆಯಾಗಿ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಬೋಡಿದಾರರಿಗೆ Cash Compensation ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಇಲ್ಲೇಕೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕದಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಹೀಗೆಯೇ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕೆಲವು ಭಾಗ Cash Compensation, ಕೆಲವು ಭಾಗ negotiable bonds ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಫ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—‘Rainfall average’ ಎಂದಿದೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಿ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕದಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವರಿಸಿದೆ.

“for purpose of this Part, the average annual rainfall of any area shall be the average of the annual rainfall during a period of twenty-five years prior to the appointed day.”

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ತಾರೇಗೌಡ.—ಭಾಗವಾಗಿರುವ ಅಣ್ಣತಮ್ಮಂದಿರು ಪುನಃ ಸೇರಿ Joint Family Co-operative Society ಮಾಡಬಹುದೇ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—There is no objection according to Law.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Can a joint undivided family members form themselves into a Co-operative Society?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Joint family land individual holding ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. The family itself holds the land. ಇದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಬಿ. ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಕಾರಣಾಂತರದಿಂದ ಅಣ್ಣತಮ್ಮಂದಿರು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯವರಾಗಿ ಒಂದೇ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು ಅವರು ಹತ್ತು ಜನರಿದ್ದು ಒಬ್ಬೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಹನ್ನೆರಡು ಜನ ಮಕ್ಕಳಾದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೇನು ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಎಷ್ಟೋ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಸಂಸಾರವಾದರೂ ಸೀಲಿಂಗಿನ ಎರಡರಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೆಂದಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಬಿ. ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಸಂಸಾರವನ್ನು ಭಾಗ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಇಷ್ಟವೇ! ಇದು ಜನರಿದ್ದಾರೆ 27 ಎಕರೆ ಒಂದನೆಯ ದರ್ಜೆ ಭೂಮಿ ಇರಬಹುದೆಂದಿದೆ.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಕೊನೆಯ ದರ್ಜೆಯ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ 216 ಎಕರೆ, ಸಂಸಾರ ದೊಡ್ಡದಾದರೆ 432 ಎಕರೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Clause 89 says:

“Any ten or more persons of a village or two or more contiguous villages holding between them, either as land owners or tenants, rights in possession over fifty acres or more in such villages or contiguous villages and desiring to start a Co-operative Farm comprising the land so held and possessed by them may apply in writing.....”

It cannot be said that the members of the Joint Family do not have interest in the land. Everybody is having interest. Could such 10 members bring into being a co-operative farming society because all the 10 members in the Joint Family will have interest in the family property? According to what you have mentioned in clause 89, you cannot rule out the possibility of 10 members in a Joint Family from bringing into being a co-operative farming society?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I doubt whether all the Members of the family can be deemed to be owners or holding lands separately.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—They are having interest just as owners and tenants.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—We will examine it if there is a doubt.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎ. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ಒಂದು ಕುಟುಂಬಕ್ಕೆ 100 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿರುತ್ತದೆ, 25 ಜನರುಹತ್ತರೆ. ಒಬ್ಬೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ 4 ಎಕರೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ‘Not less then ten’ ಎಂದಿದೆ. 25 ಜನ ಒಂದು joint family ಯಲ್ಲದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೇಕೆ 100 ಎಕರೆಯನ್ನೂ ಬಡಬಾರದು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಸಭೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿದರೆ ಆಗಬಹುದು. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಕ್ಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಆ ರೀತಿ “interest” ಎಂಬ ಪದ ಇಲ್ಲ. 89ನೇ ಕ್ಲಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ, ಇದರಲ್ಲೊಂದು ಇಲ್ಲ.

†Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum).—I think the Hon’ble Minister had read this memorandum submitted by the Planters’ Association. On page 7, they have raised one doubt and which appears to be real and that is why I am asking; and that is about the right of owning non-plantation lands. The Mysore Land Reforms Bill as it has emerged from the Select Committee of the Mysore Legislature does not specifically deal

with or provide for the right of a person to own agricultural land to the extent permissible under Clause 63 where such a person already owns land as proprietor or partner or shareholder of a plantation; which is exempted under 63 (2) (a). But such exemptions given to the plantations should not debar a person owning agricultural land to the extent provided for under the Bill. So, may I know as to whether the Government intends to exempt these planters from the operation of this Bill so far as their other agricultural lands are concerned or whether the property of planters would be taken into consideration while fixing the ceiling on agricultural holdings?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—While fixing the ceilings in respect of the lands owned by the Planters, the plantation area will be excluded and the ceiling fixed. I think that is the clear intention of the Select Committee of which the Hon'ble Member himself is also a Member.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE (Chikodi)—In Section 39, the question of sale of land to the tenant is mentioned and there in sub-section (2), market price is offered to the landlord. Is it the considered opinion of the Joint Select Committee to give this market value to the landlord or the same value as is ordinarily available by way of compensation to the landlord, that is, 15 times the fair rent *minus* the land assessment?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The intention in such cases is to give market value to the landlord because if the landlord has been permitted to sell it to others, he would get market price. It is not surplus land and it is non-resumable land.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—The position of Bombay law is different. Such a sale is also governed by principles.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It is a reasonable price. It is not the market value.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎನ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ಪ್ಲಾಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ನವರು ಒಂದು ಸಜೆಷನ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ. “The committee recommended that a provision should be made for disregarding transfers on the lines recommended by the Jatti committee or transfers made after May 1st, 1957 in Computing the surplus area.” ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನಗಳು ರ್ಯಾಂಡ ರಿಫಾರಮ್ಸ್ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ತಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದವರಿಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಬೀದಿಗೆ ಮಾರಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅಂಥಾ ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ರಿಪ್ರೆಜೆಂಟೇಟಿವ್‌ಗಳು ಅವರು ಆ ಸಲಹೆ ಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. The intention disregard the *mala fide* transactions which were entered into with a view to circumventing the law that may come into operation. *Bona fide* transactions should be protected like partition among co-sharers and *bona fide* sale for consideration, and other *mala fide* transfers should be disregarded. That is the intention.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎನ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ಈಗ ಅಗ್ನಿ ತಮ್ಮಂದಿರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ವಿಭಾಗ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ, ಪಾರಿಕತನ್ನು ಕೆಲವರು ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಮಾಡಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಕೆಲವರು ಪಂಚಾಯ್ತಿದಾರರ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಒಂದು ಅರ್ಜಿನಂ ಕಾಗವವಲ್ಲ ಪಾರಿಕತ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಕೆಲವರು ನಂಬಿಕೆಯ ಮೇರೆ ನಿನ್ನ ಈ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳ ನಾನು ಆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ವಿಭಾಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಅನುಭವಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಕಂದಾಯ ವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅಂಥಾ ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—If my recollection is correct, the law recognises oral partition also. If it is valid according to law, such partitions are protected. According to me, the law recognises oral partitions without any registered partition deed. In such cases, those transactions will be protected.

Sri B. G. KHOR.—In clause 16 sub- clause (1) (b) says :

“If the land lord owns land not exceeding a basic holding, and if the tenant is a protected tenant, the landlord shall be entitled to resume the land leased to such protected tenant.”

Sub-clause (2):

“If the landlord owns land exceeding a basic holding, he shall be entitled to resume one half of the area leased to the tenant, provided that the total area resumed by the landlord does not exceed three holdings.”

Are these provisions contradictory?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sub-clause (2) applies to other tenants, non-protected tenants.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—About clause 63. Supposing there is a family consisting of 5 or 6 members, each of them holding about 50 acres or say 27 standard acres the question of ceiling is to be considered by adding the holdings of all the members or separately.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—If it is a family, the aggregate area held by all the members will be taken into account for determining the ceiling. If the members are separate, there is no question of family.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—In sub-clause (2) of clause 87, you say that for the services rendered by the Assistant Commissioner, a sum equal to four times the land revenue is to be recovered. Does it include normal land revenue also?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—In addition to the land revenue; that is interpretation.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—It is not clear.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I will examine it.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—My question is, supposing there is a joint family. A member of the joint family may be having his own self-earned property. When the question of ceiling comes, whether the question of the joint family property will also be taken into consideration while fixing the ceiling of that person.

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA**.—According to section 63, separate properties owned by the members will also be taken into account, while computing the ceiling.

**Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE**.—There is one position of law that the partition being the subject matter with the Central Legislature, this House may not probably question the share each member of the joint family gets by partition. That would be beyond the jurisdiction of this House.

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA**.—I do not know where the difficulty is. When there is partition in the family, there is separation of interest and each member takes his share and his share would be subject to the ceiling.

**Mr. SPEAKER**.—The House will now rise and reassemble after half-an-hour.

*The House adjourned for recess at Fifty-Five Minutes past Two of the Clock and reassembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.*

(**Mr. SPEAKER** in the Chair)

†**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA** (Nanjangud).—Sir, I have had a copy of the speech of the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue made while introducing the report of the Joint Select Committee on Land Reform; and I have also heard the speech made on the floor of this House. Sir, I wish to make a few observations. I know that the scope of discussion at this stage is very restricted. I am making a few observation on the Report itself and incidentally I want to refer to one or two important points.

Sir, it is very necessary in discussing this Land Reform Bill to have a picture of the economic scene as it obtains in the rural areas in Mysore State in common with other rural areas of India. Sir, the Government flaunts or parades and shows off this economic development and feels proud of a few irrigational projects under construction or completed during these two five-year plans and a few factorie and industrial establishments which are springing up here and there. But behind these plans, the lives of the people get impoverished and anxiety prevails and grows deeper day by day. The steep rise in prices of agricultural produce have eaten deeply into the vitals of the people whose standards of living are already low and large sections of people get pushed not below the poverty line but of destitution line. Rising prices, growing unemployment and a general sense of economic insecurity experienced by the agriculturists and agricultural labour makes a mockery of all claims of development and progress in Mysore. Sir, the agricultural labourers and the middle classes

[**Sri K. KENCHAPPA** (CHAIRMAN) in the Chair]

today are getting crushed between insecure incomes and inflated prices. In a desperate struggle to make both ends meet, people forget the moral values and corruption steps through the rural areas in a large scale.

(Sri J. B. MALLARADAYA)

Sir, as a political party and as a humble representative of the P. S. P., I have to decisively reject the idea that the development of Mysore can be attempted on the impoverishment of the rural people however spectacular these plans or economic development and programmes may be that are placed before the people. The peasants and the agricultural labour have received a raw-deal so far in spite of the professions of the Government of Mysore that they have done a great deal. My Party unequivocally stands and puts forward a vigorous plea for a comprehensive integrated land reform that will make the tiller of the soil the owner. I want to make this abundantly clear on the floor of this House. There is no half-way-house in regard to this matter. Sir, if the land reforms are designed to achieve the social objectives and the Third Five-Year Plan which is under discussion on the floor of Lok Sabha is intended to reduce the marked inequalities and disparities in incomes and in the reduction in the concentration of economic power in the hands of the sections of the community—it is only under these circumstances that my party will give unqualified support to the Bill before this House.

Sir, against this background, I am afraid I can only welcome the Bill in part, not in full. Sir, the liquidation of vested interest; the securing the social justice and conferring a recognised social status to the poor agriculturists in the remotest corners of the State—these should be the guiding factors in the approach to the problem of land Reform now under consideration through the Bill that is before this Hon'ble House.

Sir, what are the achievements in this State of ours of the ruling party in this respect during the two five-year plans and during 13 to 14 years during which time they are in power? Sir, let me make it clear once again that the policy of the PSP is based on the principles of social justice and economic efficiency. As against this Sir; it is amazing that the halting, hesitant and half-hearted policy of the Government of Mysore get reflected at every stage from beginning to end and from top to bottom and even in the recommendations of the select committee. Sir, if you want to increase the agricultural production, land reform should always be in the forefront of all economic development. You are displaying a woeful lack of understanding of the nature of the economic and social justice applicable to our rural economy.

Sir, I listened to my friend the Hon'ble Revenue Minister. One thing I must say: his is the case of a person who has done BHAGIRATHA PRAYATNA. In unmistakable terms, I should say that he has put his heart and soul into this matter and worked against odds to bring this Bill before this House even at this stage. That is why I say it is rather an instance of a human-being doing BHAGIRATHA PRAYATNA. At every stage, I have felt, it.

But what do we see in this? We see that the recommendations that were contained in the original Bill have been immasculated and they have been watered down. This Bill satisfies neither the land-owners nor the tenants nor anybody for that matter. I consider without any sense of flattery that my friends the Revenue Minister and the Chief Minister appear to be the standard-bearers of land reform in Mysore State. But what is behind the scene? It is very clear from the report of the Joint Select Committee on Land Reforms that there has been a period of incubation and a period of hybernation to pilot this Bill and to place this Joint Select Committee Report before the House they have taken such a long time. What does the report indicate? There is an impress of political pressure. I expected by and large that every member of the Joint Select Committee irrespective of party affiliations would address himself to the task of bringing before this House a unanimous report. But instead of being planners and economists and instead of being people who are devoted to the concept of social justice, by and large, at least some of them, have shown themselves to be politicians. I do not intend to be either hyper-critical or cynical. We as a party on this side of the House—I am speaking for my party—wish to co-operate with the Government in all proposals for land reform where the provisions advocate a policy of bettering the lot of the tenants, the small holders and the owners of uneconomic holdings. I am fully convinced that if you want to increase food production in the country it is only land reforms in this particular or in some other form, that can achieve the object.

Before I proceed to make a few further observations I would ask the Revenue Minister to clarify a few points. What is the total number of agricultural labourers in this State? What is the total amount of land available with Government at present? What is the extent of land that would be rendered surplus by the imposition of ceiling? For whose benefit is this ceiling fixed? What about the lands held by trusts created for the fulfilment of specific purposes like education, etc.? Has Government examined the constitutional aspect involved in extending the provision of ceiling to religious institutions like Mutts and the like because in the course of his speech the Minister said that criticism has been widespread about the exemption of religious institutions from the operation of this law? I should like to know whether you have fortified yourselves as to whether the Constitution allows this kind of thing and whether they can be brought within the purview of this Bill. While referring to trusts in general I would like to refer to trusts that are devoted to the educational advancement of the country. Is it your suggestion that you are bringing a separate legislation to regulate the trusts and the mutts devoted for educational purposes? Otherwise there will be some difficulty in the implementation of this law.

Another piece of information that I want is, what is the total number of land holders owning less than 10 acres, less than 5 acres? Would the Bill provide for land ownership on a more widespread basis



(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

by the fixation of ceiling at 27 standard acres? The Bill raises false hopes that surplus lands would be distributed, but I find that all the clauses of the Bill have been tilted in favour of the land-owners. What is the total extent of land covered by the provisions relating to exemptions? That would be a very valuable piece of information before any further discussion can take place.

In considering this Bill at this stage we must remember as I said earlier that there has been a lot of delay. Here I would like to refer to the history aspect connected with this Bill because it provides very interesting information. After liquidation of the inams Government should have seriously taken to the work of redistribution of land as the most important item of land reform. I know that the Revenue Minister gave certain facts and figures in the course of his reply to some question in regard to the extent of land which is distributed in different parts of the State. Are you aware of the growing dissatisfaction in various quarters and the sense of frustration that has set in as a result of the procedure that you have adopted in the distribution of lands available at the disposal of Government for distribution? Speaking of history about this reform, it was in 1931 that the Congress passed a resolution. In 1933 at the Faizpur Session a full-fledged programme of agrarian reforms was drawn up by the Congress. In 1946 the election manifesto pledged itself to the implementation of the agrarian reforms drawn up in the 1936 Faizpur Session. In 1943 they set up an Agrarian Reforms Committee presided over by the great Gandhian thinker the late J. C. Kumarappa. His report was a very valuable guidance for those in power to implement these reforms. The next stage was in 1952, but even earlier than that, after the struggle for freedom in India, 1942 when in some States the Congress came to power they constituted various committees in several States. They went into the question of agrarian reforms. Again in 1952 on the eve of elections it is the peasants who by millions voted you to power. You were there voted by an overwhelming majority and now in many States the Congress Government is ruling as it is in Mysore. What did you do after being voted to power in the years 1952 and 1953? After the elections, the Congress of and on spoke about land reforms and I think it was the Planning Commission that made valuable recommendations, specially on the ceiling on lands, redistribution of surplus land, resumption of land for personal cultivation, quantum of compensation and the relation of tenants of non-resumable land with the State, etc. It is within the knowledge of this Hon'ble House as to what the Planning Commission's recommendations were in the first five-year plan, in the second five-year plan and what they are at the beginning of the third plan. I consider and I must express the view on the floor of this House that nothing substantial has been achieved in many States in respect of the recommendations of the Planning Commission.

In the second plan, the Planning Commission reiterated its recommendations and suggested top-priority to be given to the question of redistribution of land. There are several communications, copies of which I have at my disposal. They fixed 3 family holdings as the ceiling, as you will remember. But the Commission failed to make up its mind whether ceiling should be applied to holdings of individuals or to the total amount held by a family. It also proposed that the operation of the ceiling limit as we have provided in this Bill to coffee, tea, rubber plantations, orchards of compact area, specialised farms for cattle breeding, sugarcane farms operated by sugar factories, managed farms with heavy investments whose break is likely to lead to a fall in production. Why I am saying these things about the Planning Commission is that they too are not sure of their ground. They go get influenced. We expected that as Planning Commission they would give a definite indication of their mind. They seem to be shifting grounds from time to time except in one or two matters. In regard to resumption of land for personal cultivation, the Planning Commission was slightly, to my mind, half-hearted and that gets reflected in the latest communication which we have received from the Planning Commission. You have liquidated Inams so far as Mysore State is concerned. But what were the results of the liquidation of Inams in this State. Is it that the State benefited or is it that the tenants benefitted? I would ask the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue for figures as to what is the extent of rent which is now being recovered after the abolition of Inams in Mysore. To my mind, on the basis of the knowledge which I have been able to gather, it is the Government that has profitted and not the tenants. I am saying this with reference to various other States, notably in U. P. where the rent which was being recovered was hardly  $1\frac{1}{2}$  crores and after the liquidation of Zamindari system, the rent recovered shot upto 19 crores. The Congress Government which swears by the tenant, by the small landholder, by the peasant in the rural areas, should know that when they abolish an age-old system, it does no redound to their credit, that the State alone should take advantage of it and not the persons for whose relief they are alleged to go. If the coffers of the State are going to be benefited at the expense of the small-holder, there is no point in taking bouquets for the introduction of land reforms on a large scale.

For more than 2 years after the finalisation of the second five-year plan, most of the States remained indifferent to the recommendations of the Planning Commission. As I said before, in pursuance of the Nagpur session of the Congress, Bills were introduced in the legislatures of the States and even in our State, as a result of the recommendations of the Jatti Committee, Government have brought a Bill. I want to know whether the Government realises the consequences of delay in the enactment of the law in respect of ceilings. What effect does it have? Would you believe if I say that Government have allowed all sorts of *mala fide* transfers with a view to circumvent the provisions of this law.

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

That the Hon'ble Revenue Minister has admitted in the speech that he made today while introducing this report. I must lay the blame at the door of the Congress Government of States, and notably of Mysore, in saying that there is no uniformity in the policy of agrarian reforms throughout the country. I know that conditions are not similar throughout the country but even where similarity exists between State and State, the policy adopted whether in relation to ceilings or exemptions or payment of compensation or made of payment or exemptions, there is no uniformity. If we scrutinise the long list of exemptions mentioned in the Select Committee Report, it is frightful. A large majority of the people feel that the recommendations of the Planning Commission have been ignored and I do not think that the recommendations made by the Select Committee would be a determined step towards the attainment of the objectives which we have in view. I do not think that the lot of the cultivators of uneconomic holders would improve even after the introduction of this Bill. We have the dubious satisfaction in Mysore of sinning and sinning grievously in the distinguishing company of other States in India in the matter of making a large number of exemptions. I want the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue to reconsider the exemptions even at this stage.

I must once again lay the blame at the door of the Congress Governments in that they lack the sense of urgency in the matter of implementation of land reforms. When did you introduce the Bill? When did you refer it to the Select Committee? How many times did you meet and what happened at the Select Committee? The proceedings of the Select Committee are expected to be confidential. I must say that hesitation, vacillation, indifference and lack of regard for interests of cultivators pervaded the entire atmosphere. I am not for criticising any particular Member but to our regret we find that the party which swears by the reforms have permitted *malu fide* transfers of land so much so the effect of this Bill will be taken away. Nobody seems to be serious about the introduction of land reforms in the State. I am surprised that while presenting the report for the third five-year plan on the floor of the Lok Sabha the Planning Commission has made a statement that it is justified in stating that the main task during the third five-year plan is to effect speedy implementation of the policies already evolved. To my mind this represents a styte of absurd complacency and not in and way justified by the conditions prevailing in the country. I was shocked to hear that at the Select Committee stages some of the stalwart of the Congress including those in power and those who have enjoyed and tasted power for a short duration, had criticised the measure as discriminatory, as confiscatory or as expropriatory. People who are avowed socialists, who are pledged to bring about democratic socialism or a socialistic pattern of society, have expressed views on this question on this manner. It is staggering, to say the least. We cannot expect such people to have any interest in implementing land reforms. It is

not therefore surprising that the Hon'ble Revenue Minister towards the closing of his speech delivered a little while ago, was a little apologetic. Of course I know the mind of the Hon'ble Revenue Minister and the mind of the Chief Minister. I know that you are serious but are you carrying the entire party with you in this matter.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Without the support of the party how can I bring the Bill.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Let us both agree. The fact is very clear. There is no sense of my trying or foisting a charge on anybody. Can anybody with any sense of responsibility say that this measure is against the spirit of the Constitution? I have heard very responsible members of the Congress making observations of this character and I want the Hon'ble Revenue Minister to guard himself against any such contingency. I am personally aware that there is no fear either on the part of myself or that of my party. That is why I said.

4-00 P.M.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—You will know from the speeches made on this side that we all support.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I know very well you will not allow other views to be put forward. You will put forward people who will support you to suit you and others. It is now a tragedy and it seems very curious to hear people say that it is against the Indian Constitution. One thing I would like to say to my Honourable friends who oppose the Bill, who were very vehement in their criticism—did they not realize that this land reform is according to the directive principles of the Constitution? That should have been the foremost plan for reform before you took up anything else if you want to fulfil your pledge to the electorate you said in various manifestos.

Another criticism that you referred to in your speech was when in all other sectors you don't want to put a ceiling on income, on wealth, what is the justification for you to bring restriction or ceiling only in regard to agricultural income? I am rather shocked at that kind of argument. Restriction on wealth in various other sectors is necessitated by social justice and of social stability. I want to make it abundantly clear to my friends who are vacillating to the introduction of land reforms and to do social justice not merely social justice, but social stability—that a day may come when the man in the rural areas may be awakened to a sense of consciousness of the injustice done to him for hundreds of years and he may organise an agitation of State-wide nature, and even prudence requires as administrators that the sooner we cater to his needs and do something by way of land reform, the better.

Now, I should like to come to the next point about the criteria to be applied for examining the success of the land reform. I would judge this Bill before the House with reference to one.....

Sri S. SHARANGOWDA.—You have not made any reference regarding the other sections of the Bill. You spoke only about the ceiling. What about the other important features?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am coming to it. I will refer to it at the appropriate time if I have time and if the Chair allows me time.

The most important point on which I should like to judge the efficacy of this particular Bill is what would be—as I asked earlier—the surplus land that would be made available to the landless agricultural labour and those who are having no land? Now, how much is it in Mysore? As you know, it is computed that for the whole of India, hardly one million acres are likely to be released as a result of the various legislative measures now in force or likely to be or in the process of being implemented in the several States. This authoritative figure has been given by the Planning Commission at some stage or the other. I am again repeating it. Hardly one million acres will be available for distribution after all the legislative measures in all the States in respect of land reform are implemented. I am open to correction and the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue may clear any doubt. As against this, there is another picture. What is the extent of land that Vinoba Bhave has been able to secure, not through legislation, not through compulsion and not through any other measure, but through sweet persuasive measures, as a result of soul force, love and affection and the estimate with which the people regard him? It is computed, according to figures furnished by the All-India Congress Committee, that it is of the order of six million acres. Look at this picture and that. What compulsion can do.....

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Do we expect all these people to be Vinoba Bhaves? None of them have got beards.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I am only comparing and contrasting the two situations with a view to show and prove, if proof is needed, how legislative measures have proved to be inadequate to release land.....

Sri T. TARE GOWDA.—Most of those lands are unfit for agriculture.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I condemn those very people who give Vinoba Bhave land which was useless and if that was the spirit that permeated those people who are the Votaries of the Congress, even to deceive and defraud a person like Vinoba Bhave, further no comment is necessary. Some day if the speeches made on the floor of this House are read by Sri Vinoba Bhave, if he has the time or inclination, he will be very sorry for the suggestion you made, and I don't expect that people would have deliberately defrauded him.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Land owners are not Congressmen alone.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Unfortunately it is the Congress that takes the credit for having collected six million acres of land of owners; the majority of them were Congress men.

Sri T. TARE GOWDA.—In the Sarvodaya Mela, all parties joined.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—When it suits all parties, you talk of Sarvodaya and when it suits your party, you talk of your own *udaya*.

(Laughter)

Sir, stating it once again, as I said earlier, why has this land policy or land reform policy been ineffective ? It is because, it is a question of lack of faith in the people concerned who are out to implement and who want to introduce legislation. Sir, in regard to land resumption for personal cultivation, there is a lot of hoodwinking by some of the land owners who resort to all sorts of practices and denying the legitimate rights of the landless labour. That is one of the things which we have got to guard against. While the Bill is being passed, at the appropriate time, I would point out the appropriate things to be done. This Bill is encouraging abundantly the landlords and I shall indicate how. This is a general observation and I will substantiate it when we come to the particular sections in the Bill. It is unfortunate sometimes I feel that since there is no All-India organisation on behalf of the peasants and the landless agricultural labourers on a Statewide basis or nationwide basis there is nobody to talk of their welfare and that is how things have gone on for decades and their welfare neglected. And, it has taken fourteen years for the Congress to see what exactly are the effective reforms which will reach them. That is my reading of the things. You must not forget that these landless agricultural labourers and these small peasants form the bulwark or the bulk of the entire population and they are in the very nature of economic condition a great force. I don't want them to be a revolutionary force. Even these land reforms are very halting and hesitating. We must go the whole hog. That is the policy I advocate and my party advocates, and I want my friends on the opposite to remember that this is the position we take and against this background that I am lending support to this Bill. The basic assumption in regard to land reform is that the land being scarce, its holdings should be distributed as widely as possible. This is an axiomatic saying. What have done for more than the twenty five per cent of the people in this country who are landless and 83 per cent of the people dependant on agriculture and their dependents also ? If you do not help the people who really affected, you will not have aroused the national consciousness in them.

Here you have got a large section of the populace who are on the brink of starvation, who are not even on the margin of subsistence level. So, how can national integration be ever achieved when there is a large body of people who are dissatisfied, whose hunger has not been satisfied and whose elementary wants are not met. It is against this background that you should consider the ceilings that should be fixed,

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

whether they should be high or low. This is one fundamental point which I want my friends on both sides to remember. Any failure to remove the disparities in wealth and to permit concentration of ownership in land in a context in which the supply in relation to the people depending on is so limited is bad in ethics and bad in economics. We have hardly 2 lakhs of acres and you say that there are more than 10 lakhs of people who are landless. So, at what rate will it be distributed? These are very material facts which we should have furnished before we can give our definite views on the different clauses of the Bill. As a result of the passing of this legislative measure, what percentage of the people will be benefited? You cannot take credit and pat on your back for passing a measure. We have to consider what is the effect of it. Redistribution of land, as I said at the outset, has been a major plank in agrarian reform.

Now, I should like to come to a few observations that you have made in your speech. I first like to refer to the Planning Commission's recommendations which you have referred to at some stage of your speech. I have great respect individually and collectively for the members of the Planning Commission. They have given very valuable suggestions and they have been the mainstay for drawing up the blue print for the economic development of the country. It seems rather strange that how there should be an attempt made in some quarters or by you personally or as a Cabinet to upset the report of the Select Committee. I consider that the only body that can perhaps upset the recommendations of the Select Committee is this House. It is very embarrassing to us to be furnished with a copy of the recommendations of the Planning Commission on the Report of the Joint Select Committee. It is a very unusual step taken by this Government. Whatever may be the discussions in the Select Committee or whatever may be allegations one has made against the other, there has been a lot of give and take and it is also true that in spite of very substantial differences, there has been the largest measure of agreement on major issues involved. So, I ask where is the point in going back on those recommendations merely because the Planning Commission has made a few suggestions. I do not mean to say that they are not valuable. This seems to my mind not merely a question of prestige but a question of prestige but a question of propriety. I want the Government to seriously consider this matter.

**AN HON'BLE MEMBER.** —The idea is to control the reactions

**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.** —Now, my friend has reminded me of one thing and I want to ask, are the recommendations of the Planning Commission binding on this State. I say 'No' for this reason that you possibly know that the Madras Legislature is discussing the Land Ceiling Bill and in spite of the recommendations of the Planning Commission, they are now fixing 30 acres instead of 27 acres as decided

by our Committee. You perhaps know that the Andhra Pradesh has fixed 25 to 30 acres as the ceiling limit, the Kerala Government 15 to 20 acres, the Orissa Government 25 to 50 acres, the Uttar Pradesh Government 40 to 54 acres, Delhi 30 to 60 acres, West Bengal 25 acres and Assam 50 acres. This is the information that is available. But what is the proportion with reference to the standard acres that we have fixed? That is the information I would like the Minister to furnish if possible.

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.** The formula governing the fixation of standard acres differs from State to State. In Madras they have fixed it on the basis of the assessment. Here, it is fixed on the basis of rainfall and irrigational facilities. In other State, the basis differs. How do our standard acres compare with the ceiling limits fixed in other States? Supposing there is a ryot at the Mulbagal border. The ceiling limit fixed for him is 27 standard acres. Hardly half a furlong beyond, the Madras Government has fixed the ceiling limit at 30 standard acres. There is no uniformity in this respect.

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.**—With regard to fundamentals there is uniformity throughout the country; and with regard to some minor matters there is no uniformity.

**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.**—The question of ceiling is a very fundamental matter. Take for example, Kerala. They have fixed the ceiling at 15 to 20 acres. It is my confirmed view that the ceiling of 27 acres fixed by the Mysore Government is far too high. That is the view of my party also. It should be definitely lower.

I thought the Government did well in eliminating this institution of Land Commission which I had characterised as a costly luxury when I made a speech on the Jatti Committee Report. No doubt, you have eliminated a lot of unnecessary expenditure. But what is the substitute that you have thought of? Do you expect an ordinary Munsiff who is a judicial officer to bring to bear his judicial mind on the problems placed before him. Do you expect a Munsiff who is recruited as a result of the Public Service Commission selection and your vagaries to do justice to this work? It requires a lot of experience. It may be complimentary to a Munsiff but there are complicated issues involved which he will be required to tackle. You will have to consider whether a Sub-Judge who belongs to a higher cadre than the cadre of Munsiffs will not be required for this work. I will talk about it at the appropriate stage. You have said that the Select Committee came to the conclusion in fixing the ceiling that the extent of land should be taken and not the income. But no reasons are forthcoming as to why you have adopted this criterion. You have suddenly changed the criterion from income to extent of land. I wish the Revenue Minister had explained this.

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.**—As the Hon'ble Member himself has said the deliberations of the Select Committee are confidential. So, how can I say the grounds on which they came to this conclusion?



Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Is not this House entitled to know the very valid consideration that prevailed with the members of the Joint Select Committee to make radical changes? In fact the Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Select Committee is a radical change. I wish at least in matters like this, a word of explanation had been given by the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue.

I shall now refer to the classifications of different categories of land. In one word I should say that it is not satisfactory if you leave the adjudication of classification of lands in the hands of Munsiffs. However efficient he may be, I am sure he is going to make a mess of this. One incongruous thing is, where two crops of paddy can be grown.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I have noticed it. A land even though there is a garden crop if it has assured supply for growing two paddy crops.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA. I personally feel that this classification of land will lend itself to a lot of litigation and loose thinking and unsatisfactory determination of category at the time of final adjudication. Where did you get inspiration for this?

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—I want to ask one clarification. The classification of land in terms of garden is of two kinds. One is according to classification made by the Survey Department where irrigation is done with the help of wells—if the wells had been excavated before 1902. There is no indication in the Land Revenue Manual to show that the land is classed under the head 'garden'.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—If it is a dry land and if the owner of the land at his expense dug a well and made arrangements to irrigate the land and has grown garden crop it is still considered to be a dry land.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—One particular matter which distresses me is that the Revenue Minister made an observation that the Leader of the Opposition must know that the proceedings of the Select Committee are confidential. But, you seem to take the Planning Commission into confidence whereas you refuse to do so in the case of others.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I said that as Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition has said.....

Sri B. SHAMSUNDAR.—I want to know when the members of the Planning Commission are not the members of this House, are they entitled to know the proceedings of the Select Committee of this House?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The proceedings of the Select Committee are confidential. Nobody is entitled to know it according to the existing rules. The report when it is published it can be disclosed to anybody. But the proceedings of the Select Committee were not given to anybody.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—This being an important Bill and the Select Committee have deliberated on it for one long year, is it possible for the Government to place before the House the proceedings of the Select Committee so that we may know what they have said.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Government is not the custodian of it. The Speaker is the custodian of that.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Sir, unless the Planning Commission came to know that the Select Committee have fixed 27 acres as the ceiling, it will not have been possible for them to suggest like that. So, it is a breach of privilege. How can the Planning Commission sitting in Delhi come to know about the recommendations of the Select Committee? I want a ruling from the Chair. May I submit that this report was placed in our hands only yesterday?

4-30 P. M.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Before that, Planning Commission was not aware of this Report and the Report was not sent to the Planning Commission. It was only after that.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The contention of my friend Mr. Arumugham is what were all the facts that were placed before the Planning Commission which made them reduce the Ceiling? Unless you exposed the proceedings of the Select Committee, they would not have come to the conclusion that what you have fixed is high.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—What makes him feel that the Planning Commission Report prevails against the Select Committee Report?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—That is why they have given the confidential views of the Planning Commission yesterday.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—I wanted a clarification. Without giving your opinion as to how it took place in the Select Committee, how could the Planning Commission have arrived at this conclusion? It looks to be a sort of dictatorship?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is a most inconvenient position.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—There is no inconvenient position at all. The Report of Select Committee is a public document. When once it is published and presented to the House, on the basis of that report of the Select Committee, the Planning Commission have offered their comments.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I once again impress on the Hon'ble Revenue Minister there should be no indication whatsoever that these recommendations of the Planning Commission should be binding on us because they cannot lay down a law.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—The Planning Commission might have sent their recommendation. But why should the Members be worried about them?

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯಾ.—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾಳೆ 18 ಎಕರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಇಳಿಸಬಹುದು.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—All the proceedings of the Planning Commission and the Central Land Reform Bill are there. Our contention is that the proceedings of the Joint Select Committee have been made available to the Members of the Planning Commission.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The proceedings were not sent to the Planning Commission. It is only the report of the Joint Select Committee that was given to them.

Sri A. R. PANCHAGAVI.—Is it a cross-examination or a trial?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I have definitely and categorically told them that the proceedings of the Joint Select Committee are confidential and they were not sent to anybody.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Are we discussing the Select Committee Report or the Planning Commission Report? We are now considering the Select Committee Report. You might have brought to the notice of the Members of the Planning Commission the Select Committee recommendations. What is the competency for us to correlate the recommendations of the Planning Commission to the Select Committee Report?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—They exposed the proceedings of the Joint Select Committee.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—There should be a limit. I strongly object. When I say proceedings have been treated as confidential how can they say that? The Speaker is the custodian of the proceedings and we have not submitted them to the Planning Commission. I cannot understand why Hon'ble Members should frequently interrupt the proceedings?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In regard to future leases. I want to know why the original Bill has been changed and it has been decided that widows and unmarried women need not have the privilege of leasing out lands in future. Why are you harsh on those widows and unmarried women? Your report merely makes a statement of facts. The Hon'ble Members of this House would like to have a little clarification on some of these things where you have made drastic changes. Why you have retained minors? They cannot come under the category of physical disability. What has to happen to unmarried women and poor widows?

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Unmarried females and widows can manage their property through hired labour.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I wish the Hon'ble Lady Members expressed their views with regard to this matter. When time comes I will appeal to them. To me, it seems Sir, that the case of widows is even more urgent and more compelling than minors because minors have guardians. What about widows? ಇನ್ನಾರನ್ನಾದರೂ ಗಾರ್ಡಿಯಾ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂತರೆ, ತಮ್ಮ ಸಲಹೆ?

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—They can cultivate by engaging hired labour.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—So also minors. I am prepared to accept any suggestion made by the Revenue Minister. But the point is it is not convincing. What were the grounds on which this substantial change was made? Then with regard to clause relating to resumption of land from tenants, as I have stated in my general remarks, you are encouraging absentee landlordism. In the original Bill, 10 miles radius is one of the restrictions. Now you have removed that. You can live in Bombay and you can engage hired labour and see that your land is cultivated here. If at least during agricultural season if people reside there, it is something. You have altogether taken away that restriction regarding residence. Supposing an officer of Government has some lands in a village in Mysore Taluk, he can sit in Bangalore and get his lands cultivated. What is the point in 10 miles residence being taken away? Why did you remove it? I am merely raising issues. It will clarify discussion if these matters are replied to before further discussion takes place. Sir, I personally feel this is a very bad change which does not find unanimous support from all sections of the House. Sir, I consider that this is a substantial change and not a change at all for the better. It looks as if certain vested interests are intended to be guarded. The Government should not expose themselves nor this House should be exposed to the blame in guarding vested interests by giving effect to this amendment or change to be incorporated in the Bill. In regard to compensation you have not got two categories. One is in respect of non-resumable lands. The second is in respect of lands which the Government is taking over. That is what is contemplated in the Bill. In regard to the first category, i.e., non-resumable land it is stated that it will be 15 times the assessment. Supposing it is Rs. 400 income; it is one-fourth or one-fifth of that.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—One-fourth in the case of lands having assured water supply and one-fifth in other cases.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—One-fourth of Rs. 400 is Rs. 100. and after deducting the assessment say Rs. 10, it will be Rs. 90 and 15 times that will be Rs. 1,350. It is in the case of lands which you take over, you are giving ten times the net annual income. Supposing the yield from that land which Government is taking over is Rs. 400 similarly in which case you don't exclude the land revenue. One fourth of 400 is 100 and this is multiplied by ten. The agricultural cost of production would be Rs. 200: 400 minus 200 in this case...

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—There are two categories. For surplus land, one principle is adopted.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—A word of explanation is needed. Why two different criteria are adopted in fixing the quantum of compensation? In respect of land which Government want to take over, what do you do with the land that you take over; you want to distribute or sell it to those who intend to buy agricultural land for *bona fide* agricultural purposes. If you buy at a premium you cannot ask a landless agriculturer to buy at a premium. You are showing a preference to a man who has got non-resumable land and he sells it.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—In the case of surplus lands, the principle adopted is, the tribunal shall estimate the gross income of the land with reference to the average annual gross yield of the land during a period of three years preceding. That is section 72. Fifty per cent of the gross income is deemed to be net income in the case of surplus land.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.— $400 \text{ minus } 200 \quad 200 \times 10 = 2,000$ . In the one case you give 2,000 in the other case...

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—In the case of tenanted lands, tenant also has some interest in the land. For his interest some consideration has to be given. The landlord has some interest. We have not gone on the principle that the landlord is the absolute owner. The tenant who is cultivating the land has also some interest; the landlord has got surplus interest. For the surplus interest of the landlord he will get compensation.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—My point is this. You are discriminating against a landless agricultural labourer who is going to get the land either by grant or purchase as against a tenant who is already cultivating the land and who has already had benefits.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—He has toiled on the land for a number of years. Even according to the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, a tenant is also entitled to a portion of the compensation payable when the land is acquired.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA. I personally feel that this variable method of fixing the quantum of compensation in the two cases requires to be looked into a little more carefully. We will discuss it when the consideration of clauses is taken up.

Then in the Chapter relating to management of lands, you say that several clauses have been deleted. It is good. In regard to the giving of notice to the owner who leaves the land uncultivated for a long time, you expect the owner of the land to give you an amount equal to four times the land revenue payable for the land. Is it with reference to the land revenue for each year and how long he has got to pay? Is it that he has to pay every year for five years or is it a lumpsum, an amount equal to four times the land revenue?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—There is some doubt. I have already noticed it.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Another point which you may get examined is, in regard to dispossessing him at the end of five years, you have made no provision in the Bill. Supposing in the interval of five years the owner wants to get the land for himself. You have made no provision. Within the five year period....

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA. According to the scheme of the Bill, every lease should be in operation for period of five years. When once it is leased, it should continue for a period of five years.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is not a case of land for personal cultivation; it is a case of land for failure to cultivate the land himself he is giving the lease. Supposing he comes back.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA. If without sufficient reason, a man allows the land to lie fallow, then only the Assistant Commissioner will step in. Thereafter he will have one year's time for cultivation.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA. If that is the only means of subsistence...

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—If there are valid reasons, for instance distress conditions and the owner was not in a position to cultivate the land, in such cases, the Assistant Commissioner cannot lease the land to others.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—With regard to co-operative farming, I am happy that the Select Committee has made provision Section 89. I am glad they have recognised the need for making the entire thing voluntary. I want a clarification in regard to this matter. My friend Mr. S. D. Kothawale has also raised some points about members of a joint family. I leave it to the element of doubt, element of inconsistency that appears in Section 89 so far as partition is concerned and the status of co-parcenars of a joint family is concerned. But one thing I want to ask in this connection is this. Section 92 (3) says:

“No member of a Co-operative Farm shall withdraw his membership unless he satisfies such conditions as may be prescribed.”

You have taken credit for saying that the whole thing is voluntary and that there is no element of compulsion. Here what is incongruous, inconsistent with the avowed object of making the whole system voluntary?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It does not mean that a man can enter a co-operative farm as and when he pleases and withdraw whenever he likes. There is no compulsion at an initial stage to join a co-operative farm

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Do you mean to suggest that when the co-operative farming society is being mismanaged persistently that he wants to suffer for the sins of others? Supposing the co-operative farming society is working detrimental to the interests of the members and he wants to get out of it. Do you want him to continue and why

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

do you compel him? I think this is inconsistent with the statement you have made on the general scheme of this measure.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—The Co-operative Society is run under certain bye-laws apart from the Co-operative Societies Act. A person cannot come out though at the initial stage it is voluntarily that he joins. If a case arises of the nature that is contemplated by the Hon'ble Member, the Government will use its discretion. But, he cannot come out when he likes.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Does it mean that a person who once joins a society is wedded to it? When a member becomes a member of a society, is it for life

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—He cannot withdraw unless he fulfils the bye-laws.

Sri B. G. KHOT.—I think that this sub-clause (3) is quite redundant because a man who joins willingly a co-operative society, he is bound by every way by the bye-laws. What that is binding upon the person, there is no necessity for this clause.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Why I am saying this is, in sub-clause (4) of clause 92 it says:

“On the withdrawal of membership of a Co-operative Farm by any person, the possession of the lands in respect of which he had become a member shall, subject to such restrictions and conditions as may be prescribed, be transferred by the Co-operative Farm to such person.”

But, you say that when once he joins, he becomes a member for life. I think it is an element of compulsion. So, these two provisions may kindly be looked into. As stated by my friend Mr. Khot, if you include it in the Bill, one conflicts with the other.

Then, in regard to this one man tribunal, I have already suggested. I know the element of cost is one of the important factors that has to be taken into consideration. I do not know whether you are going to allow the Munsiffs or the Civil Judge in a particular taluk or group of taluks or you are going to have a special Munsiff for each taluk or group of taluks.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Assistant Commissioner as is provided in the Bill.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If you appoint a judicial officer who is functioning as one man tribunal, it would be like a small cause case—it would be summary proceedings. As Mr. Puttanna says, it would be “EK MAR DO TUKDA”. So, the enquiries will have to be a little different from what is contemplated in the Bill and the status of the judiciary officer whom you are thinking of is also a matter which should be taken into consideration.

Sir, you are making a provision for legal aid for very poor tenants; that is a good idea. But, the point is, what is the standard to judge whether a person is very poor or not? Many people may take advantage of this provision. You may say that a tenant who cultivates land which is not in excess of such and such figure, is entitled for such a help; a minimum of that kind should be fixed.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—That discretion should be given to the Tribunal. Even a minimum is fixed, there may be difficulties.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You have said in your speech that 90 per cent of the people are poor. So, this may be misused. Then, Sir, I think the categories of land mentioned here is simply staggering—lands mentioned under clause 27, 54, 36, 106 and so on. I agree with the Planning Commission that you have pitched the ceiling limit very high. For that matter, even if you get 100 acres, it is too little. What is the resource and what is the equitable distribution you are thinking of? The Bill may be on the Statute Book. If a large section of the people is not benefited by this, what is the use? We, as a party, do not want beyond 20 acres in any case. Sir, the maximum of 216 acres even if it is a dry land, is a fantastic figure. It looks as if we are not going to give effect to land reforms. I for one, would not lead support to this particular provision which touches the ceiling very high.

As regards plantation, I must make it very clear on this occasion that we, as a Party, are definitely in favour of exempting plantation like coffee, tea and rubber from the operation of this Bill. There may be people who may criticise us that we are encouraging vested interest and capitalists. I have already made it clear when I spoke on Jatti Committee Report that plantation stands on a very different footing. To say the least, there is no dearth for plantation land—land where coffee, tea and rubber can be grown. There are thousands of acres of plantation which is not being cultivated and ordinarily, it would require not less than 2 to 3 thousands of rupees per acre for bringing the land to render it fit for plantation purposes for coffee and the man has to wait for ten years before he reaps the first crop. There is no question of the existence of this landlord and tenant relationship.

Sri F. H. MOHSIN.—What about the paddy lands belonging to the estates?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I will come to it. If the paddy lands attached to the plantation form part of the plantation, they do not come within the purview of this Bill at all. For example, you have got some area for getting green leaf or getting various other things for the agricultural operation. They should necessarily get exemption. Why I say this is, there is no question of existence of landlord and tenant relationship so far as plantation is concerned.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—But, in the paddy lands, there will be tenants.



Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then the operation of the Bill must come to that question later.

5-00 P.M.

Sri F. X. DENIS PINTO.—What about paddy lands in those estates?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA. After all, who are the tenants who cultivate these paddy lands? They are people who cultivate the plantation crops. In Plantations there is no question of the relationship between the landlord and tenant. So far as plantation crop is concerned, we know that it is very valuable foreign-exchange earning crop. It is more an industry than agriculture. Look at the amount invested and having regard to the factors—there is no State in India which has imposed any ceiling on this plantation crop. While discussing this problem—I know that you have referred in your speech that the select committee has not agreed to exempt the areca gardens and coconut gardens from the operation of the ceiling. I do not want to enter into a discussion because discussion on this aspect has already taken place on the floor of this House also. Areca nut and coconut are not on the same level as coffee, tea and rubber. I consider that coffee should be considered to be on a different footing altogether; and though we are wedded to the question of ceiling in regard to the various other crops, my Party as a matter of policy will wholeheartedly support the exemption extended to plantation crops for various reasons. In the course of the discussion of clauses, I have got a few amendments.

In regard to the future acquisition, I do not understand the point. Supposing a gentleman who has got 500 acres of coffee land, has two or three sons. He wants that it should be divided between them. Or he wants to acquire 100 acres or 200 acres of land for improvement purposes or for purposes of expansion of his plantation. What is the nature of restriction imposed in regard to future acquisitions? Does the operation of future acquisition apply to the Members of the family? Supposing I am having a plantation of 500 acres—I am not a planter at all. I want to give 200 acres to one son and 200 acres to another. Does Bill perate as a disability in regard to this kind of distribution, because the Bill does not make it clear. I have read through the various sections very carefully.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.— Clause 64.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What is the significance of that word 'intact' Sir. I have read clause 64.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It was at the request of the planters themselves that it was inserted.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA —Sir, actually I have sent an amendment to omit that word 'intact'. It is conflicting. I cannot understand. If you please see the Madras Bill,—kindly read the Kera's Bill and the Madras Bill Sir. There is no such restriction so far as this is concerned.

I next want to know why you do not bring one particular crop namely cinchona under this.

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.**—Is it cultivated on a large scale in Mysore State? It is not cultivated at all, except by the Forest Department.

**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.**—What is the objection to make a provision for it Sir, because many people taking advantage of absence of provision, may take to cinchona cultivation hereafter. I am even making a suggestion that we may even start an industry in Mysore State. It is needed for medicinal purposes.

There is also another suggestion in regard to future acquisitions. It should not be classified along with other crops. One suggestion is that coffee may be classified along with other lands in schedule 1 so that they may take their chance as other land-owners.

If the intention of the Government is to kill the plantation Industry.....

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.**—It is not my intention.

**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.**—That is why I say there is no perspective, there is no imagination and there is no vision. My party may be criticised as trying to favour planters. I am trying to look at it as an industry of the first magnitude, so far as India is concerned. What is the amount of coffee grown in Mysore and what is the money that you are getting from coffee industry in Mysore State? Is there any other industry from which you get so much money to the State exchequer? Coffee industry stands on a different footing. Even as a matter of principle, I want to make it clear having regard to the industrial production of the State, having regard to the necessity for earning foreign exchange and having regard to the peculiar nature of the industry as such, this exemption that is allowed to plantations is in order and the only point is you will have to make the position clear.

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.**—The suggestion was in regard to future acquisition.

**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.**—Sir, as I said, there is no dearth for land. How many applications today are pending with the Government of Mysore for 100 acre blocks of plantation land? Even after you have expressed a desire that you are prepared to give it? Merely on ideological grounds, you should not do it. What is the amount of agricultural incometax you are getting from these plantations? What is the amount of sales-tax that you are getting? The incometax that you are getting. The only point is an industry of this magnitude has to be encouraged. That is the point. It does not stand on the same footing as other agricultural lands—wet, dry or garden land. And I would like that cinchona may be brought in. I have agreed with the recommendations of the Joint Select Committee.

Sri G. SIVAPPA.—What about arecanut gardens ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—How many agriculturists are there who own arecanut gardens in excess of 27 acres ? I want to ask the Hon'ble Revenue Minister. It is hardly applicable to the circumstances of the case.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—In the case of Arecanut, if it is a first-class land, they can have 27 acres ; if it is second class land, they can have 36 acres ; and if it is third class land, rain-fed area, they can have 54 acres.

Smt. K. S. NAGARATNAMMA.—If it is dry-garden land ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—According to the extent admissible in the particular class. If it is 5th class land, 108 acres and if it is sixth class, 162 acres.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I want to invite the attention of the Hon'ble Minister to his speech on page 7.

Then, Sir, in the whole of this Bill somehow or other the Joint Select Committee has not taken into consideration the idea of economic holdings. How is it that nowhere in the Bill I see the expression economic holding? Even in regard to co-operative farming the whole idea of co-operative farming was to see that holders of uneconomic holdings form themselves into a co-operative farming society to get the benefits and advantages contemplated under section 102. Why is this idea of economic holding not coming there. There is not even a definition of it here. I feel that the concessions contemplated in clause 102 are very unusual favours:

(1) "A co-operative farm shall be entitled to such concessions as may be prescribed.

(2) \* \* \*

(3) For purposes of this section, co-operative farm shall be deemed to include a co-operative society registered before the appointed day under the law relating to registration of co-operative societies, as a co-operative farming society."

I want to know whether you have brought in educational institutions and hostels within the purview of this Bill so far as concessions are concerned. Suppose a hostel registers itself along with its students who own some lands as a co-operative farming society.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—If it is registered it will be entitled to this concession.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Look at the long list of concessions. They are likely to misuse them. The concessions are:

- (1) reduction of land revenue;
- (2) reduction of or exemption from agricultural income tax;
- (3) free technical advice from experts employed by the Government;

- (4) financial aid and grant of subsidies and loans with or without interest; and
- (5) priority in irrigation from State irrigation works.

Is it that you want to give a fillip to co-operative farms? If that is your object I do not wish to say anything. But my only fear is that many people will misuse all these concessions. You have got the experience of so many agricultural co-operative societies and multi-purpose co-operative societies. They are misusing all the liberal concessions extended to them with the best of intentions. If there is anything that could be done to prevent the misuse of the very generous concessions extended to them under section 102 of this Bill it would be a very good thing.

Then there is another provision to which I want to draw your attention and that is the provision regarding the appellate authority. You say that the decision of the appellate authority shall be final that only points of law may be referred to the High Court. I submit that the original legal process must be allowed to take its usual course. Why is it that you have put a bar on appeal to the High Court? It is only when the appellate authority feels that there is a question of law, it may refer it to the High Court. In the original Bill you had made provision for reference of questions of law to the High Court by the Assistant Commissioners and Deputy Commissioners. I had objected to it then. I am glad you have changed it now. My point is, why not make a provision in the Bill itself for appeals to the High Court.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It will result unnecessary litigation by which the poor man will be put to suffering.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If Government can hear appeals against the decision of the Revenue Appellate Tribunal.—

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—There is no provision for Government to hear appeals. The decision of the Tribunal is final. I have never interfered with the decision of the Revenue Appellate Tribunal.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Is it merely to avoid litigation that you want the matter not to go to High Court on appeal?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Yes.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Why should you not allow the people affected to go in appeal to the High Court under the Bill?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—They can go to the High Court on a writ petition ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I should like the Government to make themselves sure as to whether this decision of the Joint Select Committee in not excluding the religious institutions from the purview of this Bill would be thoroughly constitutional. I do not wish to offer any comments at this stage because I am not myself sure. There are many people who are trying to terrorise us that it is against the Constitution.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—We have abolished religious inams already.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You seem to do only such things as Revenue Minister.

One general observation which I want to make is in regard to distribution of land. As mentioned by me earlier, Government should not expose themselves to the blame of being very inconsistent in what they say and what they do. Very recently I had occasion to visit Chamarajanagar. I found that in the Harehanahally Hobli there are more than 10,000 acres of land available. They are forest lands, date reserve lands and ordinary lands available for distribution. For a period of more than three years I have gone into this matter in detail. Generally I am not an agitationist, but when I feel that wrongful injustice has been done to a large majority of people there, it is a very serious case which the Revenue Minister has got to take note of. They have given me a memorandum. They have said that if within 45 days their grievances are not redressed, like Tara Singh they are going to fast. This is not a frivolous matter. There is a lot of feeling in this matter. It is unfortunate that the local officers do not seem to have brought to your notice the position. There seems to be a lot of politics there. That is the feeling of the average ryot including Harijans. There is land available and there are different sects of people who have got possession of land and they are cultivating, but no action is taken against them. But when people make regular applications and Darkhasts affixing Rs.2 stamp you do not take them into consideration.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—We have appointed a special officer for distribution of land in Mysore District. He has been given a jeep and sufficient staff. He has distributed more than 50,000 acres during the last three years.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It makes matters worse. Here is a glaring case of agitation going on and yet no action is taken.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA — I do not know whether the Forest Department is in a mood to release that land. Unless that is done it is very difficult to distribute the land.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The people will begin to lose confidence and faith in the Government. With one breath the party shouts from house-tops that they stand by the small-holders, landless peasants and do good to them and in another breath when there are thousands of acres within the limits of a particular hobli and when there are applications, Government is disinclined to distribute them and the applicants are driven from pillar to post.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I will look into that, if it is land under the Revenue Department.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA. — These lands come under three categories land under the control of the Revenue Department, lands which are date reserve land which are awaiting handing over to the Revenue Department and also forest lands. I am surprised the very Harijan friends who made applications for lands, out of 200, 100 of them have been persuaded to withdraw. In spite of that, when the local officers do not intervene, one feels frustrated while going round the villages and trying to redress grievances. I know only the Ministers can redress their grievances but atleast we can bring them to the notice of Government.

With these few words I commend the Bill and request the Hon'ble Revenue Minister to be a little more accommodating when clause-by-clause discussions take place. I wish to assure him on behalf of my party that we will give our unqualified support so far as the principles of the Bill are concerned but in regard to details it is my hope that by mutual agreement and after discussions, I would be convinced of the reasonableness of his stand or in the alternative he should be convinced of my arguments.

Thank you.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಬಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ (ಶ್ರವಣಬೆಳಗೊಳ) — ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಭೂಮಿ ಯನ್ನು ಹಂಚಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಮನೋದಯವನ್ನು, ನಮ್ಮ ನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಬಹಳಕಾಲದ ಮೇಲೆ ಆದರೂ ತಂದಿರುವುದು ಒಂದು ದ.ವಿ.ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪಮ್ಮೆಯ ವಿಷಯ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒಳಗೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ನಾವು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೋ ಆ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಷ್ಠಾನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕಾದರೇ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಅನೇಕ ಅಡಚಣೆಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಜಾಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪಕ್ಷದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಾವು ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಮನೋದಯ ಕೆಲವೊಂದು ಭಾಗಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅದೇ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಈ ಮನೋದಯ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಲು ನಿರಾಸವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಅಡಚಣೆಗಳನ್ನುಂಟು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಡ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಹಂಚುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಒಟ್ಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಗಳಿಸಲು ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಒಡವರಿಗ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ವೇದಿಕೆಗಳ ಮೇಲಿನಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿ ಈಗ ಕಾಲ ತಪ್ಪುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾವು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ ಕೂಡ, ಬಹುಶಃ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಮೂವರನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ, ಉಳಿದವರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿರಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಭಾಸವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಮನೋದಯವನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದು ಬಡ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ವಾದದಲ್ಲಿ ತಿರುಳಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ನಾವು ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಜಿ.ಪಿ.ಸಿ.ತಿ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಟರ್ಚಿಸಿದಾಗ, ಡ್ರಾಫ್ಟ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದಾಗ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ತತ್ವವಿಲ್ಲ, ಒಂದು ನೀತಿಯಿಲ್ಲ, ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುವಂಥ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರುವಾಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನೇಕ ಅಡಚಣೆಗಳು ಬಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇಂಥ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 1962ರ ಮಹಾ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳು ನಡೆಯುವುದರೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದು ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನನಗೆ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಸಹ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕಡಿರಾಫ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಜಿ.ಪಿ.ಸಿ.ತಿ ವರದಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅನುಕ್ರಮ ಇದೆ: ಇರಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ ಅನೇಕ ಹಿಂಬಾಲಕರು ಇದನ್ನು ಜಾಗೃತ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹಗೌಡ)

ಅನುಷ್ಠಾನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬಾರದೆಂದು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಜತ್ತೆಯವರಾಗಲಿ, ಕಡಿವಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರಾಗಲಿ ಸ್ವಾರ್ಥಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟರಿ ಬೆಡುಗುಳ್ಳಿ ಇರಬೇಕಾದ್ದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೊರಗತೆ ಬಂದು ಮೃಕಡೆ ಬರಲಿ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಬೆಂಬಲವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಜಾಗೃತ ಅನುಷ್ಠಾನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡೋಣ.

ಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರಿ ಇರುವವರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಗೇಣೀದಾರರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಬೇಕೆಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಮನೋನುಸಾರವನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಆದರೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಶೋಧಿಸಿ ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ತರಹ ಅಡಚಣೆಯೂ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀನಿ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಬಹಳ ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ಇರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ನವರು ಬಹುಶಃ non-agriculturists ಅವರಿಗೆ theory ವಿಷಯ ಗೊತ್ತಿರದೆಯೇ ವಿನಃ practical ಆಗಿ ಅದರ ವಿನಯ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ನವರೂ ಇಡೀ ದೇಶದ ಅನೇಕ ನಾಯಕರೂ ಆಗಾಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೂ, ಇದೀ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವಂತೆ ಒಂದು ಸಮಗ್ರವಾದ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ನವರಿಗೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯದ ವಿಷಯ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ, ಒಂದೊಂದು ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದೊಂದು ರೀತಿ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿರುವಂತೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಬಹುದೇ ರೀತಿಯ Common Bill ಇಡಿಯಾದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವಂತೆ ತರಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು.

ತಮ್ಮ ಮನೋಭಾವನೆ ಹೇಗಿದೆಯೆಂದರೆ, ದೊಡ್ಡ ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರು ದೊಡ್ಡ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಾಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಉನ್ನತ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಗಾರರನ್ನೆ ಅಧೋಗತಿಗೆ ಇಳಿಸಲಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಂಟಿಯಾದ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರ್ಮ್ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಮನ್ ರಾ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅದನ್ನು ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ನವರು ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ರೈತರ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿರುವುದೇ ಕಾರಣ.

5-30 P. M.

ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಯಂಟ್ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್‌ನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ, ಸೋಶಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ತರುತ್ತಿರುವ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಗಳಂತೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ನವರು ತಿಳಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಲಹೆ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಸೆರೆಕ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ನವರು ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡಿರುವ 27 ಎಕರೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಎರಿಯಾ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮೂಲ ತತ್ವ ಎನ್ನಿಸುವುದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀನಿ. ಕಡಿವಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರಿಗೂ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸಮಾಜದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊರಟಿರುವುದಾದರೆ 5 ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಇದ್ದು ಎರಡು ಬೆಳೆ ಬೆಳೆಯತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರಿಗೆ ಬಹುಶಃ ನಮ್ಮ ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ, ಹೊಸ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಬಹಳ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಇದನ್ನು 20 ಎಕರೆಗೆ ಇಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೀವಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಕೊರ್ಮನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್.—ಯಾವಾಗ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿದಿರಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹಗೌಡ.—ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವರೇ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು 20 ಎಕರೆಗಿಂತ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಇಡಬಾರದು. ಬಹುಶಃ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಯಂಟ್ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್‌ನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಡಿ. ಕೊತಾವಳಿ.—ಪರಮಾನ ಎಷ್ಟು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ? What is the income of 20 acres that you propose.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಫ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.— ಸುಮಾರು ಎರಡು ಬೆಳೆ ಬೆಳೆಯತಕ್ಕಂಥವರಿಗೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಸಾವಿರರೂಪಾಯಿ ಮೇಲೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. 5 ಜನ ಇರತಕ್ಕವರಿಗೆ ಒಹಳ ಕಡಿಮೆ ! ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಜನ ಇರುವವರಿಗೆ 40 ಎಕರೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಅಫೆಕ್ಟ್ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 72 ಪ್ರಕಾರ One-fourth ರಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡರೂ ಅವರೇಜ್ ಇನ್ ಕಮ್ 400 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಪರ್ಸನಲ್ ಕಲ್ಟಿವೇಶನ್ ಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾರಿಗೂ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—You are not replying to my question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Let there be less interference.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್.—ಸೀಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡಿದರು You are saying something against the statement of your leader.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—He said whatever happens in any other sector, there should be ceiling on agricultural income.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.— ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಎಂದೂ ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಹಾಕಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇತರ ಮೇಲೆಯೂ ಹಾಕಿ ಬರೀ ಆಗ್ರಿಕಲ್ ಚರಿನ್ವುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆಯೇ ಹಾಕಬೇಡಿ. ಇದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಬೇರೆಯಾವರಿಗೂ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Your leader spoke on behalf of the Party that there should be ceiling on agricultural income, whereas the Hon'ble Member is saying that there should be no ceiling on agricultural income unless ceilings are fixed on other incomes.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Do you assure that your statement is the considered Statement of your party ?

Mr. CHAIRMAN.— I understand some interruption, but not much.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಫ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.— ಆಗ್ರಿಕಲ್ ಚರ್ ಇನ್ ಕಂ ಆಂತ ಅಂದರೆ, 20 ಎಕರೆ ಗಿಂತ ಬರೋ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಅಫೆಕ್ಟ್ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನೀವು ತಿಳಿಮಾಡಿದಿರುವ ಅರ್ಥ ಬೇರೆ.

ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಿಂದ ವಾಕ್—ಟೀಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಹಾಜರಿಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವುದು ಮುಂತಾದವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರಂಮ್ಸ್ ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರಿಗೆ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರ್ಮ್ಸ್ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವ ಶಕ್ತಿಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೂಲತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಕಳೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ನಾಚಿಕೆಗೇಡು. ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ ನೋಡಿ.

ಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರು.— ಬಿಲ್ಲನ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿಬಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ. ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್, ಕಾನ್ಫಿಡೆನ್ಸಿಯಲ್ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿ ಆಗಿ ಹೋಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಫ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರಂಮ್ಸ್ ನನ್ನು ಮೂಲೋದ್ದೇಶದಂತೆ ಇಂತ ಮಂಚೆರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ನಿಜವಾದ ಇಷ್ಟ ಇದೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರ್ಮ್ಸ್ ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯು ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ ನನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಂಚಿದರೆ ಅವಾಗ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಂಚಿದರೆ ಸತ್ಯವಾದ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರು ಇವ್ವಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು ! ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬೂಟಾಟಿಕೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರೂ ಕೆಲವರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮುಚ್ಚು ಮರೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸವನ್ನು ಇದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಶಕ್ತಿ ನನಗಿದೆ. ನಾನು ರಾಜಕೀಯಕ್ಕೆ ಇವತ್ತು ಇಳಿದಿಲ್ಲ ರಾಜಕೀಯದಲ್ಲ 20 ವರ್ಷದಿಂದ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.



Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, my friend Mr. Kothawale is heckling Sri Narasimhe Gowda because he spoke something and that he is not consistent with the ideas on which his leader spoke. Let my friends on the other side say what was the inconsistency between Narsimhe Gowda and the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—He will give that information later.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—The Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition pleads that there should be ceiling on agricultural income and agricultural holdings, whereas, if I have understood Hon'ble Narasimhe Gowda properly, he said that there should not be such ceilings on land unless ceilings are placed on other sectors also. Is that the policy of the Party?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಫ್. ಬಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಜಮೀನಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಮಾಡುವುದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ವೆಲ್ತ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ತನ್ನ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am afraid that my friend Mr. Kothawale is reading a meaning or putting something into my mouth which I have not said, i.e. unless you bring in the ceiling in different sectors, you should not insist on ceiling in respect of agricultural income. I say it is a fantastic argument. They are absolutely quite different, because bringing ceiling on land is the primary consideration, because of the policy of the Government and the ideological ground on which they have issued the manifesto. So far as wealth other sectors are concerned, social stability requires it and social justice requires it. I am quite sure, I said this.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—I was only saying that Sri Narasimhe Gowda contradicted it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಫ್. ಬಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ತಿರುಗ ಅವನೇ ಆಡ್‌ಮಿಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆಡ್‌ಮಿಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ತಯಾರಿಲ್ಲ. ಟ್ರಿಶರಿ ಬೆಂಚ್ ತಂದಿರ ತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರ್ಮ್ ಪಾಲಿಸಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪತಕ್ಕದ್ದೆಂದೂ, ಈ ಮನೂವೆಯನ್ನು ತರುವಾಗ ಇತರ ವೆಲ್ತ್ ಮೇಲೆಯೂ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು. ಇದನ್ನು ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿಬಿಟ್ಟು, ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಈ ರ್ಯಾಂಡು ರಿಫಾರಂನು ಬಿಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಎಕರೆಮಟ್ಟು ಮಿನಿಮಂ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಸಣ್ಣ ಸಂಸಾರಕ್ಕಾಗಲೀ, ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುವವರಿಗಾಗಲೀ, ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಇತರ ಸ್ಪೆಷಿಲಿಟಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಐದು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಈ ಸ್ಯಾರ್ ಹೆಲ್ಪ್‌ರಿಂಗ್‌ಗೆ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯು ಲೆಫ್ಟರು ಒಂದು ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಎರಡು ಎಕರೆಗಿಂತ ಐದು ಎಕರೆಯಷ್ಟಿರಬೇಕು. ಇದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಕಡಿಮೆಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಯಾವ ಸಂಸಾರಕ್ಕಾಗಲೀ, ಅಥವಾ ಸೇರವಾಗಿ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುವವರಿಗಾಗಲೀ ಸಹಾಯ ದೊರಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕದಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಬೇಸಿಕ್ ಹೋಲ್ಡಿಂಗ್ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಎಂಟರಿಂದ ಒಂಭತ್ತು ಎಕರೆಗಳನ್ನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಬೇಸಿಕ್ ಹೋಲ್ಡಿಂಗು ಎರಡು ಎಕರೆಯಿಂದ ಐದು ಎಕರೆಯವರೆಗೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸ್ವಾಂಧರ್ದು ಎಕರೆ ಐದು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—What should be the ceiling ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ನೀಲಿಂಗು ಇಷ್ಟತ್ತು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರಂಸನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಸರಕಾರ ಬಹು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ನಾವು ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಂಡಿರುವಹಾಗೆ, ದೇಶದ ಜನಗಳೂ ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯಿಂದ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿ ಇಲ್ಲದವರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಸಿಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನಿಟ್ಟು ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಜಮೀನು ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕವರು ಎಷ್ಟು, ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ವೆನ್ನು ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುತ್ತಿತ್ತು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಸುಮಾರು ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತೈದು ಲಕ್ಷ ಎಕರೆಯಷ್ಟು ನಾನ್ ರೆಸಲ್ಯೂ ಮಬರ್ ಭೂಮಿ ಸಿಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತೈದುಲಕ್ಷ ಎಕರೆ ಗೇಣಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸುಮಾರು ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ಸರ್ವೆಸ್ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಇತ್ತು. ಇದು ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ಲೆಸ್ ಲೇಬರರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ವಿವರಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒತ್ತಿ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ಲೆಸ್ ಲೇಬರರುಗಳು ಆಗಿರುವವರು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲ ಒಟ್ಟು ಎಷ್ಟು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಅವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾಳೆ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—Apart from this surplus land, what is the land available with Government.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I have already said that during the last 3½ years we have been able to distribute about 5 lakhs acres of waste lands which were at the disposal of Government. I will give the information which the Hon'ble Member has asked for.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—Only those people who contacted the Revenue Minister were given lands.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—No. I am not at all granting land. Even Mr. Madappa's people can get land is available.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—I am not attacking you personally. Suppose landless people approach the Thasildar, they do not get land.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—We need not waste our time over such matters.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಈ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರಂಸನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ನಮ್ಮ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ಎಕರೆಯಷ್ಟು ಸರ್ವೆಸ್ ಜಮೀನುಗಳು ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ಲೆಸ್ ಲೇಬರರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದರ ಜೊತೆ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ಲೆಸ್ ಆಗಿರುವವರು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಮಾಳೆ ಎಷ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಲ್ಲ. ಇವರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಹಂಚತಕ್ಕ ನಿಯಮವನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ವೆನ್ನು ಜಮೀನು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವಹಾಗೆ, ಮರಗಿಡ ಬಾರದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಏರಿಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ಎಕರೆ ಇದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಈಗ ಪ್ರೊಪೊಸನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈಚಲು ವನದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವ ಜಮೀನು ಇವೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಟ್ರಾ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದ ರಿಲೀಸ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ, ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರಂಸು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವಾಗ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಫ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ)

ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರಿಂದ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥಾನಾಯಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಈಗ ದೇಶದ ಅನೇಕ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಂಚುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಾದ, ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮುಂದೆ ಜನರನ್ನು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ನ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಒಟನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವ ಕಾಲಬಂದಾಗ ಇದರ ಅರಿವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಚಾಮರಾಜನಗರದಲ್ಲಿ ಫಾರೆಸ್ತು ವಿರಿಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸುಮಾರು 3,000 ದರಬಾಸ್ತು ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೂ 45 ದಿನಗಳೊಳಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಅವರ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಹಂಚಿ ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಸಿಕ್ಕದೇ ಹೋಗಿರುವ ಒಂದೇ ಕಾರಣ ಸಾಕು. 1957ರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದವರು 1959ರಲ್ಲಿ, 1960 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನ ಚೋಪಿ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಪೊಲಿಟಿಕಲ್ ಸಪರರುಗಳೆಂದು ಅವರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರ್ವೆಕೇಟ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆಸ್ ರೇಬರುಗಳು ಜಮೀನು ಹೀಗೆ ಸಿಗಬೇಕು? ಅವರೇ ಒಂದು ಸಂಸಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದಂತೆ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಹತ್ತು ಜನರ ಮೇಲೆ ಬೇರೆ ಹಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಪೊಲಿಟಿಕಲ್ ಸಪರರ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಅವರಿಂದ ಒಟನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವ ಆಸೆಯಿಂದ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಕೋಡಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಜಮೀನು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆಸ್ ರೇಬರುಗಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಸತ್ಯವಂತರಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಈ ರೀತಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ದಿಸ್ತ್ರಿಕ್ಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಚಾಮರಾಜನಗರದ ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದವರಿಗೆ ನೂರು, ಇನ್ನೂರು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಇತರ ಜನರು ದರಬಾಸ್ತು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವನ್ನು ರಿಜೆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೂ ವಾಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆಸ್ ರೇಬರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ.

(Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair.)

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—After I became the Revenue Minister, Government must have distributed 9 lakhs of acres to the landless people. Out of that, only a few thousand acres might have been given to the political sufferers.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Will you tell us what is the quantum of land that has been given to the political sufferers and to other people?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಫ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ. — ನಮ್ಮ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರ ಹೃದಯ ಬಹಳ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಇರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ದರಬಾಸ್ತು ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ರಿಗೂ ಅಂದರೆ ಯಾರು ಜಮೀನು ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅಂತಹವರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವಾಗ ಈ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಕೋಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ಪೊಲಿಟಿಕಲ್ ಸಪರರ್ಸ್ ಗೂ ಸಹ ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಏಕೆ ತೆಗೆಯಬಾರದು, ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಯೂನಿಫಾರಂ ಆಗಿ ಜಮೀನು ಸಿಗಲಿ ಎಂಬ ಮೂಲತತ್ವ ನಿಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿರುವಾಗ ಕೇವಲ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಒಟು ಕೊಡುವವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ನಿಮ್ಮ ನನ್ನಾಹದ ನೀತಿ ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಸಾಧುವಾದುದಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಹಿಂದೆ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರಮ್ಸ್ ಬಿಲ್ ಯಾವ ಸ್ಟೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿತ್ತು ಆ ಸ್ಟೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಲೂ ಇದ್ದುಹೋಗಿ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ನಿಲುವು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಇದು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿತ್ತು ಆಗ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಕಾರಣ ಆ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ. ಈಗ ಎರಡು ಸ್ಟೇಜ್ ಇವೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯದು ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ

ಈ ಮನೂದ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಯಾಗಿ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಕೆಲವು ತತ್ವಗಳನ್ನು ಆಗಲೇ ಕರ್ತನಿರೀಕ್ಷಾ ಸ್ಪೆಷಿನ್ಯ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈಗ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸುಗಳನ್ನು ನೀವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರೋ ಅಥವಾ ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೀರೋ ಅ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಎರಡನೆಯ ಸ್ಟೇಜ್ ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಈಗ ಆ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರಮ್ಸ್ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೆಲವು ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪುನಃ ಫೈಮ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವಾಳು ರೋಪದೋಷಗಳು ಒಳಗೊಂಡಿವೆಯೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅವನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಹನುಮಯ್ಯ.—ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರಮ್ಸ್ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಎಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ! ಇನ್ನೂ ಎಲ್ಲ ಈ ಬರ್ ಚೆಕ್ ಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆಯಲ್ಲಾ!

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಇತರೇ ಸ್ಟೇಜ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಶೇಷ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕದ 74 ಮತ್ತು 84 ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕಂಪೌಸೇಷನ್ ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ಲೆಖ್ಯದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಕಂಪೌಸೇಷನ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರೈತರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಪಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ 500 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳೇ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆರೀತಿ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಬರುವ ಕಂಪೌಸೇಷನ್‌ನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಖಾಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೀವು ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಫೈನಾನ್ಸಿಯಲ್ ಸ್ಟೇಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿಯಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮೆಮೊರಾಂಡಮಿನಲ್ಲಿಯಾಗಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಬರುವುದನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಸರಿದೂಗಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್‌ಫೈನ್ ಜಮೀನುಗಳವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕಂಪೌಸೇಷನ್ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ಲಿಯರಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈಗಲೇ ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಪ್ರೀಕುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಫಾರಮ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿ ಅಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಫಾರಂ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಂತ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಗಾರ ಏನು ಬೆಳೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದನೋ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಬರ್ಹಿಜಾತ ಏನು ಅವನಿಗೆ ಫಾಯಿದೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿತ್ತೋ ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಅವನ ಕೈ ಸೇರುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಫಾರಂನಿಂದ ಉಂಟಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲ ತರಹ ಸಹಾಯವು ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಗಾರನಿಗೆ ಉಂಟಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಉನ್ನತ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ತರಹ ಸಹಾಯವು ಈ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಫಾರಂಗಳಿಂದ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಸಿಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಫಾರಂಗಳಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಜಮೀನು ದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುವ ರೀತಿ ನೀತಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಫಾರಂಗಳಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಲಿ ಜನಗಳಿಗಾಗಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕೆಲವರು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರು ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಫಾರಂ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ತರಹ ಬೆಂಪಿಟ್ಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದಲ್ಲ, ನಾನಾ ರೀತಿ ಸಾಕಾಣಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಗೊಬ್ಬರ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕಬ್ಬಿಣದ ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳು, ಉಪಕರಣಗಳು, ನೇಗಿಲು ಮರ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ)

ಮುಖ್ಯಗಳು ಇನ್ನೂ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್-ಹೀಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನೂ ಈ ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಫಾರಂಗಳಿಂದ ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಈಗಿನ ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಫಾರಂಗಳಿಂದ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಏನೇನು ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳು ದೊರಕಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಅವೆಲ್ಲವೂ ಈಗ ಫೇಲ್ ಆಗಿವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಚಿ. ಹನುಮಯ್ಯ.—ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್, ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್‌ನವರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಬೇಸ್‌ಲೆಸ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಅಪ್ಪು ಸುಲಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಈಲ್ಡ್ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸೀವೇನೂ ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ನನ್ನ ಮೈಂಡ್ ಬೇಂಜ್ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಹನುಮಯ್ಯನವರು ಬೇಸ್‌ಲೆಸ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಬೇಸ್‌ಲೆಸ್ನಾಗಿ ಎಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬಹುದೇ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಬೇಸ್‌ಲೆಸ್ ಎಂದು ಅನ್ನಬಾರದು ಎಂದೇನು ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಫಾರಂ ಮಾಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಫ್ಲೋ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಸಮಾನವಕಾಶವಿರುವಂತೆ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ನಾನು—ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರಿಗೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಫಾರಂ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಫ್ಲೋ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ನಮಗೆ ಪವರ್ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ತಮಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟ ಬಂದಂತೆ ದುರುಪಯೋಗ ಪಡಿಸುವವರಲ್ಲರೂ ನಿಮ್ಮವರೇ ಹೊರ್ತು ನಮ್ಮವರು ಯಾರು ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇಂತಹ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಫ್ಲೋ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಬಹಳ ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ 50 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಇರಬೇಕು ಅಥವಾ 10 ಜನ ಅಥವಾ ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಂದಿ ಕೂಡಿ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸಿಗ್‌ನೇಚರ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದೇನಿದೆ, ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಮಗೇನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳುವುದಿದೆಯೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವಾಗಲೂ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ಯೂಚರ್ ಡಿಫಿಕಲ್ಟಿ ಏನೇನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲೇನ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ಸರ್ಕ್ಯೂ ಹೀಗಿದೆ, ಹಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಮೊಗಮ್ಯಾಗಿ ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದೇನೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾಳೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ The House will now rise and meet to-morrow at one P.M.

*The House adjourned at Six of the Clock to meet again at Thirty Minutes past Eight of the Clock on Friday, the 1st September 1961.*